

## Epiphanius' *Alogi* and the Johannine Controversy

# Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae

*Editors*

J. den Boeft  
B.D. Ehrman  
K. Greschat  
J. Lössl  
J. van Oort  
D.T. Runia  
C. Scholten

VOLUME 135

The titles published in this series are listed at *brill.com/vcs*

# Epiphanius' *Alogi* and the Johannine Controversy

*A Reassessment of  
Early Ecclesial Opposition to  
the Johannine Corpus*

*By*

T. Scott Manor



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Want or need Open Access? Brill Open offers you the choice to make your research freely accessible online in exchange for a publication charge. Review your various options on [brill.com/brill-open](http://brill.com/brill-open).

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: "Brill". See and download: [brill.com/brill-typeface](http://brill.com/brill-typeface).

ISSN 0920-0623X

ISBN 978-90-04-30938-8 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-30939-5 (e-book)

Copyright 2016 by Koninklijke Brill nv, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill nv incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Hes & De Graaf, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Rodopi and Hotei Publishing.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill nv provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper and produced in a sustainable manner.

# Contents

Preface	IX
Abbreviations	X

Introduction	1
--------------	---

## SECTION I

### *The 'Johannine Controversy' Theory*

<b>1</b>	<b>The Evidence</b>	<b>15</b>
1.1	Irenaeus	16
1.2	Hippolytus of Rome	17
1.3	Gaius of Rome	18
1.4	Origen	19
1.5	Dionysius of Alexandria	20
1.6	Epiphanius of Salamis	21
1.7	Dionysius bar Salibi	26
1.8	Ebed-Jesu	32
<b>2</b>	<b>An Implausible Consensus and a New Way Forward</b>	<b>34</b>
2.1	The Formation of a Consensus	35
2.2	Challenges to the Consensus	45
2.3	The Fall of the Consensus?	48
2.4	A New Way Forward	48
<b>3</b>	<b>Exonerating Gaius of Rome</b>	<b>52</b>
3.1	The Gaian Paradox	53
3.2	The Historical and Literary Legacy of Gaius	55
3.3	Gaius of Rome vs. bar Salibi's <i>Caius Haereticus</i>	57
3.4	The Dates of Gaius	60
3.5	Gaius and the Fourth Gospel	64
3.6	Gaius and the Apocalypse	74
	Summary	81

- 4 Dismantling the Syrian Evidence: Dionysius bar Salibi and Ebed-Jesu** 84
- 4.1 Scholarship on bar Salibi's Sources 85
  - 4.2 The *Catalogue* of Ebed-Jesu 93
  - 4.3 Dionysius bar Salibi: A Closer Look at the Evidence 97
  - 4.4 Discrepancies between bar Salibi and the Early Sources 110
  - 4.5 The Manufactured Dialogue between Gaius and Hippolytus 114
  - 4.6 Epiphanius and bar Salibi 116
  - Summary 119

## SECTION 2

### *Epiphanius and the Alogi in Context*

- 5 Epiphanius: History and Heresy** 123
- 5.1 Epiphanius as Historian and Heresiologist 123
  - 5.2 Dissociating Hippolytus from the *Alogi* 130
  - Summary 142
- 6 Epiphanius' *Alogi* in Context** 143
- 6.1 Outline of the Account of the *Alogi* 143
  - 6.2 The Broader Context of the *Alogi* 147
  - 6.3 Epiphanius' *Alogi*: A Sweeping Defense of the Four-fold Gospel 149
  - Summary 159

## SECTION 3

### *The Sources of Epiphanius' Account of the Alogi*

- 7 Epiphanius' Use of Papias and Irenaeus** 163
- 7.1 Papias on the Origins of the Four Gospels 163
  - 7.2 Irenaeus and the Four-Fold Gospel 166
  - 7.3 Irenaeus' Testimony as the Foundation of the *Alogi* 167
  - 7.4 Irenaeus and the Second Objection to the Gospel of John 173
  - Summary 176
- 8 Epiphanius' Use of Origen** 177
- 8.1 Origen on the Authority of the Gospels 177
  - 8.2 Origen and Epiphanius: Differing Hermeneutical Paradigms 179

8.3	Origen and the Discrepancies Among the Gospels	184
8.4	Origen and the First Criticism of the <i>Alogi</i>	185
8.5	Origen and the Second Criticism of the <i>Alogi</i>	189
8.6	Origen or Gaius of Rome?	191
8.7	Other Examples of Anti-Origenism in Epiphanius' Account of the <i>Alogi</i>	195
	Summary	198
<b>9</b>	<b>Epiphanius' Use of Eusebius</b>	<b>200</b>
9.1	Eusebius, Papias, and Origen on the Four Gospels	200
9.2	<i>HE</i> 3.24.8b–13 as a Corrective of Origen	211
9.3	Epiphanius' Appropriation of Eusebius' Rebuttal	213
9.4	Eusebius as the Source for the Criticism of Porphyry, Celsus, and Philosabattius	214
9.5	Other Connections between Eusebius and Epiphanius	217
	Summary	219
<b>10</b>	<b>Sources Behind the <i>Alogi</i>'s Objections to the Apocalypse</b>	<b>220</b>
10.1	The Reception of the Apocalypse Prior to Epiphanius	221
10.2	Origen and the Apocalypse	225
10.3	Dionysius of Alexandria and the Apocalypse	227
	Summary	229
	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>230</b>
	<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>233</b>
	<b>Index of Modern Authors</b>	<b>250</b>
	<b>Subject Index</b>	<b>251</b>





## Preface

My heartfelt thanks go first to Sara Parvis who generously offered her support and guidance throughout my research as a doctoral student at the University of Edinburgh. Paul Parvis and Paul Foster have also given much time, attention, and advice at various points throughout my research. Frances Young and Helen Bond kindly provided incisive and critical feedback on the earliest version of this work as a doctoral thesis. As this work emerged into its current form, Mattie Kuiper, Tessa Schild, and Debbie de Wit at Brill have proven to be as gracious as they are skilled in seeing it through the publication process.

I am very grateful to Charles E. Hill, whose scholarship, guidance, and friendship have had a significant impact on this work. For their excellent scholarship on Epiphanius, for their kindness, and for their thoughtful feedback I am indebted to Young Kim and Andrew Jacobs. I am also fortunate to have worked with dear friends and colleagues at the University of Edinburgh and Knox Theological Seminary, who have been a wonderful source of encouragement and camaraderie.

The New College Library at the University of Edinburgh offered numerous resources that facilitated the majority of this research. When it became necessary to view ancient manuscripts or other special resources, the *Bibliothèque Nationale de France*, the Bodleian Library, and the Vatican Library graciously accommodated my requests.

I would like to give special thanks to my parents, Tim and Beth Manor, for their love, encouragement, and generosity. The sincerity of their Christian faith has challenged and influenced my own.

Most of all, my deepest appreciation belongs to my wife, Rebecca. Her constant support and encouragement have been crucial in seeing this project through to the end. Her joy and sense of humor ensured that I maintained a balanced perspective. Her intellect, editorial eye, countless hours of discussing and reading drafts, and genuine interest in this project have influenced every single page of the book. It is to her and our two kiddos that I dedicate this work.

# Abbreviations

<i>Adv. Marc.</i>	Tertullian, <i>Adversus Marcionem</i>
<i>Adv. omn. haer.</i>	Pseudo Tertullian, <i>Adversus omnium haereseum</i>
<i>Adv. Val.</i>	Tertullian, <i>Adversus Valentinianos</i>
<i>AF</i>	Lightfoot, <i>Apostolic Fathers</i>
<i>AH</i>	Irenaeus, <i>Adversus Haereses</i>
<i>AJT</i>	American Journal of Theology
<i>Ancor.</i>	Epiphanius, <i>Ancoratus</i>
<i>Ant.</i>	Hippolytus, <i>De Antichristo</i>
<i>Bibl.</i>	Photius, <i>Bibliotheca</i>
<i>BO</i>	Bibliotheca Orientalis
<i>C. Cels</i>	Origen, <i>Contra Celsum</i>
<i>Comm. Apoc.</i>	Dionysius bar Salibi, <i>In Apocalypsim, Actus et Epistulas Catholicas</i>
<i>Comm. Jo.</i>	Origen, <i>Commentarium in Joannem</i>
<i>cSCO</i>	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
<i>CSEL</i>	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
<i>Dan.</i>	Hippolytus, <i>Commentarium in Danielelem</i>
<i>De Prin.</i>	Origen, <i>De Principiis</i>
<i>De vir. ill.</i>	Jerome, <i>De Viris Illustribus</i>
<i>Dial.</i>	Justin Martyr, <i>Dialogus cum Tryphoni</i>
<i>Div. her. lib.</i>	Philaster, <i>Diversarum heresion liber</i>
<i>GCS</i>	Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller
<i>Haer.</i>	Epiphanius, <i>Panarion</i>
<i>Haer. fab. comp.</i>	Theodoret, <i>Haereticarum fabularum compendium</i>
<i>HE</i>	Eusebius, <i>Historia Ecclesiastica</i>
<i>Hom. Luc.</i>	Origen, <i>Homilia in Lucam</i>
<i>HTR</i>	Harvard Theological Review
<i>JBL</i>	Journal of Biblical Literature
<i>J ECS</i>	Journal of Early Christian Studies
<i>JEH</i>	Journal of Ecclesiastical History
<i>JR</i>	Journal of Religion
<i>JSNT</i>	Journal for the Study of the New Testament
<i>JSNTSupp</i>	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
<i>JTS</i>	Journal of Theological Studies
<i>NovT</i>	Novum Testamentum
<i>NovTSupp</i>	Novum Testamentum Supplements

<i>PG</i>	P.G. Migne, <i>Patrologia Graeca</i>
<i>PTS</i>	Patristische Texte und Studien
<i>Rbib</i>	Revue Biblique
<i>Ref</i>	Hippolytus, <i>Refutatio Omnium Haeresium</i>
<i>SC</i>	Sources Chrétiennes
<i>TU</i>	Texte und Untersuchungen
<i>TZ</i>	Theologische Zeitschrift
<i>VC</i>	Vigiliae Christianae
<i>VCSupp</i>	Vigiliae Christianae Supplements
<i>WUNT</i>	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
<i>ZNW</i>	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche

\*All translations are my own, except where otherwise indicated.



# Introduction

Despite the profound influence that the Johannine corpus has had on Christian theology throughout history, its acceptance and role in the earliest years of Christianity has been a matter of debate for a long time. Scholarship has produced numerous works on the reception of the Johannine literature, many of which have focused on the questions of which person or group was responsible for their authorship, when and by whom these works were first used, and which theological group(s) they originally supported. A number of other studies are devoted to the question of whether the Johannine corpus was originally a 'heretical' production, or if it was always considered to be a part of the accepted writings within the 'orthodox' church.<sup>1</sup>

Such inquiries are critically important in seeking to determine the role of the Johannine corpus in the development of the church's canon of accepted writings, and the varying hypotheses that have emerged from these studies

---

1 Throughout this work the terms 'orthodoxy', 'ecclesiastical', 'heresy', and 'heterodoxy' as well as other similar terms are used despite the fact that such designations are inherently anachronistic and, to one degree or another, imprecise. The difficulties that accompany the use of these terms are perhaps best articulated in the work of Walter Bauer, one of the most notable products of twentieth century scholarship. See Walter Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1934), ET, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, eds. Robert A. Kraft and Gerhard Krodel (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971). Although many of his conclusions have drawn serious questions and intense criticism—this work is no exception—perhaps Bauer's greatest achievement was his appreciation and articulation of the complexity of the theological world in the first centuries of Christianity. It is true that terms such as 'orthodoxy' and 'heresy' do not accurately capture the variety of forms within earliest Christianity, or *perhaps* even what comprised the 'majority' and 'minority' representative factions. However, alternative terms such as 'proto-orthodox' or 'proto-catholic' do not provide a satisfactory recasting of the language and perceived notions of such terms. They only serve to blur the existing vocabulary, to soften its edges; they do not provide new, non-anachronistic, and stable categories of understanding the various theological distinctions, divisions, and complexities within early Christianity. Moreover, the argument that there was a severe lack of some discernible form of what has become commonly known as orthodox Christianity in the first two centuries need not be overstated. The witness of the early Fathers and the broad coherence of their theological tenets are not as volatile and incoherent as Bauer suggests. Nevertheless, as with Bauer (xxii–xxiii), in this work I shall use the terms 'orthodoxy' and 'heresy' along with their synonyms and derivative terms to represent what one customarily understands them to mean, with the unfortunate realization that such language continues to fail to adequately express the complex world of earliest Christianity.

reflect the complexity of the evidence from this era. Nevertheless, there is one common formulation of the extant evidence that has received widespread acceptance over the past century of scholarship, which postulates that the early church was originally very reticent, if not actively opposed to accepting the Johannine corpus as authoritative. The present study calls into question the viability of this prevailing view commonly known as the 'Johannine Controversy'.<sup>2</sup>

It is often said that the early church's opposition to the Johannine corpus is seen most clearly in its consternation concerning the Fourth Gospel. Indeed, the extant evidence may suggest that those who first appropriated this text in support of their theology were heretical groups such as the Gnostics, Montanists, and Docetists. As these heretics continued to develop their controversial theological claims based on this gospel, the early church was distancing itself from it more and more. In the words of one scholar, 'To trace the influence of the fourth gospel upon Christian theology would be more than the task of a lifetime; to trace its influence upon the thought of the first half of the second century is easy, for it had none.'<sup>3</sup>

Thus, if the early church were to have accepted the Fourth Gospel it would have threatened early Christianity by implicitly endorsing and potentially adopting the views of the heretics that preferred this text. In contrast, to reject it as a heretical forgery would serve to rid the church of such cancerous, heretical opinions. The choice was clear, so also was the decision: the early church threw the Johannine baby out with the heretical bathwater. This rejection originally took the form of silence towards the Fourth Gospel by the Apostolic Fathers, eventually graduating into explicit rejection.<sup>4</sup> The watershed moment when John's Gospel finally emerged onto the orthodox scene came by way of Irenaeus' treatise, *Adversus Haereses*, in which he transformed it from a liability to an asset in his efforts to condemn and eradicate heresy.<sup>5</sup> And yet many

---

2 A full survey of scholarship that comprises this consensus view on the role of the Johannine literature in the early church is provided in Chapter Two.

3 C.K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text* (London: SPCK, 1955), 52.

4 As Bauer notes, 'If we listen to the sources without prejudice, it seems to me that this is the result: a current of caution with regard to the gospel of John runs continuously through ecclesiastical Rome, that center of orthodoxy, right up to almost the end of the second century—a mood that manifests itself through silence and through explicit rejection.' Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy*, 208. All citations of this work will follow the pagination of the English translation.

5 In addition to Walter Bauer, other notable works on this topic include (but are by no means limited to): A. Bludau, *Die Ersten Gegner der Johannesschriften* (Freiburg: Herder & Co.,

scholars suggest that Irenaeus was not a fair representative of the greater ecclesiastical opinion towards the writings attributed to John.

In fact, the Fourth Gospel was not the only Johannine work to have a mixed reception. Initially, particularly in the west, the Johannine Apocalypse enjoyed positive welcome and near universal attribution to John the Apostle. However, about the same time that the Gospel of John was finding its rightful place in some of the church fathers' lists of accepted works, the Apocalypse was beginning to disappear, for it too had ties with an assortment of heresies. Some questioned its use by the Montanists, while others claimed it was the work of the arch-heretic Cerinthus. By the fourth century it had completely vanished from the canonical lists of Cyril of Jerusalem and Gregory of Nazianzus. Yet, questions about its authenticity and theology had surfaced a century earlier with Dionysius of Alexandria, followed by Eusebius of Caesarea, both of whom had their own suspicions about its authorship and reservations about its chiliastic eschatology.

When all of the bits of evidence are assembled together, the common view is that the early church was initially hostile to the idea of accepting both the Gospel and Apocalypse of John, and to a lesser extent the epistles that bear his name. Although it is undeniable that the evidence surrounding the authority and acceptance of these works in the first centuries of Christendom is complex and at times disjointed, is it possible to say with certainty that the early church had originally set its face against those works that would later steer Christian theology for centuries to come?

Recent scholarship has begun to reassess this question. Most notably, Charles E. Hill, in his important work, *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church*, aims to counteract this view that he dubs 'orthodox Johannophobia'.<sup>6</sup> Hill is not alone. Other scholars have questioned whether the influence of the

---

1925); J.N. Sanders, *The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1943); the unpublished dissertation of M.R. Hillmer, 'The Gospel of John in the Second Century' (Th.D. diss., Harvard University, 1966); Hans von Campenhausen, *The Formation of the Christian Bible*, trans. John A. Baker (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1972); E. Haenchen, *John: A Commentary on the Gospel of John Chapters 1–6*, trans. R.W. Funk (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984); R.M. Grant, 'The Fourth Gospel and the Church,' *HTR* 35, n. 2 (April 1942): 95–116; T.E. Pollard, *Johannine Christology and the Early Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970); J. Charlesworth, *The Beloved Disciple: Whose Witness Validates the Gospel of John?* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1995); J.D.G. Dunn, 'John and the Synoptics as a Theological Question,' in R.A. Culpepper and C. Clifton Black (eds.), *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 308. R.A. Culpepper, *John: The Son of Zebedee, the Life of a Legend* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000).

6 C.E. Hill, *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

Johannine corpus in the early church, especially that of the Fourth Gospel, has been underestimated.<sup>7</sup> These studies provide new and valuable considerations regarding the extent of early orthodox appropriation of the Johannine literature. However, despite all the ink that has been dedicated to numerous efforts to discern whether and to what extent the early church did, in fact, use the Johannine literature, there has been surprisingly little attention paid to the evidence concerning whether or not the early church actively opposed these writings. This is a critical issue that, although distinct, should not be divorced from the question of the ecclesiastical reception of the Johannine writings.

And yet the methodological approach of Hill and others to delimit the use of the Johannine writings in early Christianity does not necessarily indicate whether or not the early church wilfully rejected or accepted them. For example, just because the Gospel of John is not explicitly cited among the Apostolic Fathers does not *necessarily* mean that they rejected it. However, one should also exercise caution in regards to counter claims. Just because there is some evidence to suggest that the Gospel of John was familiar to some within early orthodox circles does not require the conclusion that it was widely and positively received. It is equally plausible to conclude that such evidence may only represent particular segments of early Christianity that found it acceptable while others did not. Thus, the question of how and to what extent the Gospel of John was used or ignored cannot produce adequate results to the question of whether or not the early church actively *opposed* it. In order to arrive at the answer to this question, it is necessary to begin from a different starting point that focuses directly on the evidence concerning such opposition. Such is the purpose of the present work.

---

7 See especially the collection of essays in T. Rasimus, ed., *The Legacy of John: Second-Century Reception of the Fourth Gospel*. NovTSupp 132 (Leiden: Brill, 2010). Other notable works include: M. Hengel, *The Johannine Question* (London: SCM Press, 1989) and *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ* (London: SCM Press, 2000); Titus Nagel, *Die Rezeption des Johannevangeliums im 2. Jahrhundert: Studien zur vorirenäischen Auslegung des vierten Evangeliums in christlich-gnostischer Literatur*. Arbeiten Zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte, 2 (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2000); Kyle Keefer, *The Branches of the Gospel of John: The Reception of the Fourth Gospel in the Early Church* (New York: T&T Clark, 2006). Also, Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2006); also, 'Papias and Polycrates on the Origin of the Fourth Gospel,' *JTS* 44 (1993): 24–69; Charles E. Hill, *Who Chose the Gospels?* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010). Another recent collection of essays addressing these concerns is: Peter Head (ed.), *Historical and Literary Studies in John: Challenging Current Paradigms*. WUNT 2 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007).



Where exactly does one find evidence that the early church actively engaged in a campaign against the Johannine literature? After all, if the ecclesiastical leaders made efforts to expunge these texts from the church, it is natural to expect to find some evidence of their anti-Johannine campaign. If this movement were widespread, as is often argued, the volume of evidence should be substantial. The paucity of such evidence is surprising, however. It is not until the fourth century that one finds unambiguous testimony that tells of a faction within the church that rejected the Johannine writings as heretical forgeries. Epiphanius of Salamis is the earliest extant witness to record the anti-Johannine views of a group known as the *Alogi*. This group claimed that Cerinthus was the true author of the Gospel and Apocalypse of John, and thus they should be rejected as heretical forgeries. Although the *Alogi* have achieved significant notoriety in New Testament and Patristics scholarship, many scholars have overlooked, set aside, or were unaware of the various difficulties in establishing the dates, provenance, theology and constituency of this heresy. These questions are important, and a close examination of Epiphanius' testimony in light of other early sources demonstrates that there is much more to the story of this heretical sect than has been recognized.

### Epiphanius' *Alogi* and the Early Orthodox Opposition to the Johannine Corpus

In the last quarter of the fourth century, Epiphanius compiled a catalogue of heresies known as the *Panarion*, or 'medicine chest', in order to provide fellow believers with a set of remedies for the 'toxic bites' of the 'snake-like heresies'. This work was in response to the request of two presbyters, Acacius and Paul, who knew of Epiphanius' reputation as a great slayer of heresies and therefore desired a full list of sects to be avoided. Epiphanius was certainly not the first to compile such a catalogue, yet he is the earliest extant witness that mentions a certain group that explicitly rejected the Gospel and Apocalypse of John as works of Cerinthus. He devotes the fifty-first entry of his *Panarion* to this sect, and he furnishes them with the name '*Alogi*'.

Chronologically, Epiphanius places these *Alogi* immediately after the Quartodecimans (*Haer.* 50) and well before the Noetians (*Haer.* 57), thus some time in the late second or early third centuries. This being the case, one might expect to find some evidence of the *Alogi*'s existence in the writings of other contemporary church fathers. Surprisingly, earlier heresy-hunters do not expound upon such a heretical group. The *Alogi* do not appear in Irenaeus' list of heresies, nor are they included in Hippolytus' *Refutatio*. Similarly, the *Alogi*

are not mentioned in Pseudo-Tertullian's work against the heresies; they do not appear on Tertullian's radar; Origen knows nothing about them; and no mention of them is made by Eusebius who was quite taken with matters concerning the authority and integrity of Christian literature.

One would naturally suppose that a group with these anti-Johannine convictions would have caught the attention of one or more of these Fathers, and yet not only is there general silence about these *Alogi* from other early witnesses, Epiphanius himself is not forthcoming in detailing any their defining features. As a result, there is a healthy level of confusion surrounding the provenance of the *Alogi*, with scholarly opinions ranging from Asia Minor to Rome.<sup>8</sup> The dates that scholars attach to the *Alogi* are equally speculative. Some maintain that they emerged prior to Irenaeus,<sup>9</sup> while others argue that Hippolytus railed against them in a work that was lost in the unfolding of time.<sup>10</sup> Some believe the *Alogi* were active from the time of Origen to the era of Dionysius of Alexandria.<sup>11</sup> Despite the possibility of a century-long window of *Alogi* activity, it remains a period of time in which no other church father mentions them by name.

What about their theological tenets? On this account the *Alogi* are many things to many people. For some, the *Alogi* opposed the Gospel of John because it was the preferred Gospel of the Gnostics.<sup>12</sup> Others maintain that the *Alogi* disliked the Montanist use of John.<sup>13</sup> Some split the difference, claiming they were scared of *both* Gnosticism *and* Montanism.<sup>14</sup> Why not add the Quartodecimans to the list of John-loving heretics that made the *Alogi* take

---

8 Rome: see Dom John Chapman, *John the Presbyter and the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911), 53–4 n. 1; Sanders, *Fourth Gospel*, 35. Asia Minor: see von Campenhausen, *Formation*, 238. See also Fr. Vincent Rose, 'Question Johannine: Les Aloges Asiates et les Aloges Romains,' *Rbib* 6 (1897): 516–34.

9 Vincent Henry Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents* 3 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1903), Vol. 1, 200; Robert M. Grant, 'The Origin of the Fourth Gospel' *JBL* 69 (1950), 307; Campenhausen, *Formation*, 242 n. 184.

10 See Bludau, 165.

11 See E. Schwartz, 'Über den Tod der Söhne Zebedaei. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Johannesevangeliums,' *Abhandlungen d. Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wiss. N.F.* VII, 5 (1904), 44–53; also the Ph.D. dissertation of J.D. Smith Jr., 'Gaius and the Controversy over the Johannine Literature' (Ph.D. Diss., Yale University, 1979), 195–6.

12 Sanders, *Fourth Gospel*, 110; C.K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 2nd ed. (London: SPCK, 1978), 66–84.

13 Campenhausen, *Formation*, 242; Schwartz, 'Über den Tod,' 44–53.

14 Haenchen, 23–4.

up arms?<sup>15</sup> Or, perhaps it is sufficient to claim that the orthodox-minded *Alogi* simply detected ‘a spirit of heresy’ in the Johannine literature that could not be reconciled with the ecclesiastical attitude in Rome.<sup>16</sup> Nevertheless, despite all the confusion and conflicting views surrounding the dates, provenance, and theological tenets of the *Alogi*, they are heralded as representing a widespread ecclesiastical movement against the Johannine corpus.

But exactly how widespread were these views? Which members of the early church belonged to this sect? Epiphanius refrains from naming names. In addition to the general notice that they rejected the Johannine Gospel and Apocalypse and attributed both to the heretic Cerinthus, the only identifying information that he provides are two criticisms from this group against the Fourth Gospel and three against the Apocalypse. Against these charges, Epiphanius attempts his own counter-assurances of Johannine veracity and integrity. As a result of the limited information Epiphanius provides, questions have persisted throughout history regarding the precise nature of this heretical group.

It is true that the answers to the questions surrounding the *Alogi* are to be found in Epiphanius’ sources; however, this approach is more complex than one might expect. For centuries scholarly attempts to secure details about this group were largely relegated to speculation due to the fact that there were no clear lines to be drawn between Epiphanius’ account and those of his predecessors. But at the end of the nineteenth century a discovery was made that would breathe new life into the question of the *Alogi*. This recent addition to the pool of evidence came by way of two Syrian sources that were written nearly a millennium after the time of the *Alogi*. Dionysius bar Salibi and Ebed-Jesu both note that a certain ‘Gaius’ held anti-Johannine views that, when juxtaposed to the objections of the *Alogi*, were strikingly similar.

Various conclusions were soon reached as a result of this ‘new’ evidence. For one thing, the relatively obscure third-century Roman church figure, Gaius of Rome, emerged as the leader and possibly the sole constituent of this heretical group. Although this identification has become widely accepted throughout modern scholarship, there is ample reason to suggest that it is the mistaken result of questionable methodology and a sloppy handling of the evidence. In particular, it is assumed that a lost work by Gaius, or perhaps a polemical work against him, was the common source for both Epiphanius and the later Syrian sources. Methodologically, this presumes too much upon Epiphanius’ reliance upon earlier sources and fails to take into account the unique way

15 Grant, ‘Fourth Gospel’, 108–10.

16 Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy*, 208.

that he conceived of and recorded his history of heresy, which, as recent studies have shown, was a blend of fact and imaginative fiction.<sup>17</sup> As to the critical question of his sources, this approach also presumes the content of works that are lost, and which may or may not have existed in the first place.

In order to sustain the current view that Gaius of Rome and his fellow members of the *Alogi* led a sweeping movement against the Johannine literature, it is necessary to cobble together different pieces of evidence spanning over a millennium while presuming the existence and content of works that may be nothing more than a figment. To be sure, the picture of the ecclesiastical figure Gaius of Rome as the leader of the *Alogi* as opposed to his otherwise boring reputation as an 'orthodox churchman' and staunch anti-Montanist makes for a fascinating and compelling story of how the early church once tried to dispose of the Johannine literature. However, this approach relies on a significant methodological problem that must be reassessed. It prioritizes the later evidence rather than the earliest sources, and it makes the fundamental assumption that the later testimonies of Dionysius bar Salibi and Ebed-Jesu are as reliable, or *more* reliable, than the surviving sources from the era in which the *Alogi* supposedly coordinated their anti-Johannine campaign. To determine whether or not this is the case, the veracity of these later sources must be judged in light of what the earlier sources tell us, not the other way around.

### Methodology and Outline

The purpose of this book is to ask afresh what has become a very familiar question: Did the early church once reject the Johannine Corpus? However, it departs from similar studies in two fundamental ways. First, in contrast to many works on this topic, it argues that it is anachronistic, presumptuous, and methodologically dubious to begin such an inquiry with the later sources. Because the Syrian evidence of bar Salibi and Ebed-Jesu provides information that is not explicitly found in the earlier testimonies, it has become fashionable to interpret the latter in light of the former; however, this reverses the proper methodology of the historian. Second, this book is not primarily concerned with the related but distinct issues regarding how, when, and by whom the Johannine materials were first appropriated. It is certainly true that this inquiry indirectly relates to others that are concerned primarily with early

---

17 T. Scott Manor, 'Epiphanius' Account of the *Alogi*: Historical Fact or Heretical Fiction?' *Studia Patristica* 52 (2012), 161–170; Young R. Kim, 'The Imagined Worlds of Epiphanius of Salamis,' (Ph.D. Diss. University of Michigan, 2006).

*appropriation* of the Johannine literature, but its trajectory is aimed at a very different line of inquiry focused on putative *opposition* to these works.

The guiding methodology of the present work is to refocus attention back on the early evidence that might speak of the existence of early ecclesiastical opposition to the Johannine corpus. As such, the earliest explicit record of such activity provided by Epiphanius, in addition to other second- and third-century sources that are contemporaneous to the time in which the *Alogi* are said to exist, are given primary attention. It is true that for centuries the incongruities of the early evidence ultimately led to a dead end for many scholars who tried to pin down the details about the *Alogi*; however, as I shall argue, the same conclusion is ultimately true of studies that prioritize the later evidence as well. There is clearly a need for a new way forward that makes sense of the all the evidence. And yet the question may rightly be asked; if both of these approaches lead to inconclusive results, how does the methodology of this work shed new light on an old problem?

The inadequacies of both approaches are due in large part to a fundamental misunderstanding of Epiphanius' methodology in composing the *Panarion* and his reasons for creating it in the first place. He approached this work from the perspective of a concerned pastor and rigid theologian whose imagination caused him to occasionally blur the lines between fact and fiction. When compared with earlier heresiologies, the *Panarion* tends to be regarded as historically sloppy and theologically shallow. Yet this is due, at least in part, to the fact that Epiphanius conceived of the entire history of the world as an epic struggle between the faithfulness of God and purity of the gospel message against the erroneous beliefs that deviated from the truth, from the time of Adam to his own day. There is, therefore, an imaginative aspect to Epiphanius' historiography which must be recognized in order to arrive at a better understanding of *why* he composed the *Panarion* the way he did. In turn, the otherwise confusing, disjointed, or garbled aspects of his writing begin to emerge with greater clarity. Ultimately, his imaginative historicizing is best understood in light of the pastoral care he had for his flock in Salamis and elsewhere. The *Panarion* reveals his concern to protect fellow believers against the threat of false belief, actual or potential. In the case of the latter, such fictitious sects are not conjured out of thin air, for Epiphanius does not create heresies; rather, one can discern traces of various sources that he has woven together to create a seemingly coherent picture from a disparate group of evidence. In many ways, therefore, his approach parallels that of many modern scholars that create a coherent narrative based on fragmented pieces of information.

These three issues I have just discussed—the history of scholarship and its deficiencies, Epiphanius' unique perspective of recording history and

refuting heresy, and the methodology he used to accomplish this task—reflect the themes of the three sections into which this work is divided. In the first section, I catalogue the extant evidence followed by a review and dismantling of the scholarship that has interpreted this evidence as bearing testimony to a vibrant ‘Johannine Controversy’ in the early church. Inspired and informed by various challenges to the consensus view, I offer further arguments against the reliability of the later evidence and provide reasons why Gaius of Rome should be exonerated from the false accusations of theological and canonical impropriety. A new paradigm is thus required to provide a new way forward into the question of the *Alogi* and the Johannine Controversy.

The second section examines how Epiphanius’ role and methodology as a historian and heresiologist led him to construct various abstract heresies in the *Panarion*. The *Alogi* is certainly not the only such heretical sect that suffers from dubious historical grounding. When one considers the historical and theological context that preceded Epiphanius, his rationale for wanting to secure the theological and canonical integrity of the Fourth Gospel and, to a lesser extent, the Apocalypse becomes more apparent.

The third and final section assesses how Epiphanius went about constructing the *Alogi*. In fact, he used a variety of earlier sources in this account, each of which makes some mention of the Gospel or Apocalypse of John; none, however, fully reflect the way Epiphanius describes the *Alogi*. They are like pieces of a puzzle, each of which adds to the picture Epiphanius paints. A close look at the relationship between Epiphanius’ account and sources such as Papias, Irenaeus, Origen, Dionysius of Alexandria, and Eusebius reveals that he has amalgamated aspects from each of these sources and used them as ‘building blocks’ for his account.

Over the years many scholars have told different versions of the story of the secretive and menacing *Alogi*, and yet I find it surprising that to date there has not been a full-length study devoted to this heretical group. Does the evidence support the story of a subtle yet forceful ecclesiastical movement against the works attributed to John the Apostle? Or were the *Alogi* a cleverly devised heretical figment that Epiphanius constructed in order to vanquish the heretical opinions of those who failed to understand and appreciate the integrity of these works? The conclusions reached in the following pages point toward the latter. As such, they are at odds with those of many illustrious patristic historians past and present who have contributed to the overall discussion with which this work is concerned. Yet when the evidence does not tell the same story as its interpreters, there is a need to dismantle the broken paradigm and provide an alternative explanation. Such is the primary contribution of this work. An equally important contribution of

this work is the new light it sheds on the misunderstood and often maligned fourth-century bishop.

Epiphanius is almost always interpreted through paradigms and criteria that produce negative results. From a strictly historical point of view, his work tends to be seen as frequently garbled and a poor substitute for the works of his predecessors on which he relied heavily. As a theologian, he is known less for his doctrinal insights and theological acumen than for his all-consuming anti-Origenism. As a man, he comes off as a rigid, disenfranchised blowhard. In fact, as one scholar notes,

Of all the church fathers, Epiphanius is the most generally disliked. It would be easy to assemble, from the writings of patrologists and historians of religion, a bill of particulars against him. He is a heresy hunter, a name caller, and “nasty.” His judgments are uncritical. His theology is shallow and his manner of holding it intransigent. Above all he vehemently opposed the teachings of the great commentator Origen, the first Christian systematic theologian and as a thinker far superior to Epiphanius.<sup>18</sup>

In no way do I claim that such an assessment is entirely unfair or inaccurate. However, there is more to the story of this Cypriot bishop and the works he composed. The story of the *Alogi* demonstrates this, and yet it only begins to scratch the surface of this complex church father and his writings. Reconsidering Epiphanius within the context of his own biography and historiographical methodology reveals a parallel storyline of a concerned pastor and exegete whose imaginative approach to history and theology had a more significant impact on contemporary and modern readers of his work than has been recognized thus far.

---

<sup>18</sup> Frank Williams, trans., *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis, Book I (Sects 1–46)*. 2nd ed. (Leiden: Brill, 1994), xxxi.





## SECTION 1

### *The 'Johannine Controversy' Theory*





## The Evidence

By the latter part of the nineteenth century virtually nothing was known with any certainty about the *Alogi*. It was seen as an anomalous heresy of the early church, mentioned by name only in the writings of Epiphanius and largely ignored by other early sources. That was then. Today, the *Alogi* are regarded as the epicentre of a full-scale 'Johannine Controversy' in the Roman church at the dawn of the third century. Over the past century it has become commonly accepted that one of the members of the *Alogi*, the bishop Gaius of Rome, spearheaded an influential movement to reject the Gospel and Apocalypse of John as the products of Cerinthus, the heretical nemesis of the Apostle John. In his day, Gaius' position was not only 'permissible'; it also reflected the general ecclesial sentiment of the time.<sup>1</sup> It was only after many years of sustained counterattacks by Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Origen and Eusebius that the dangerous ideas of the *Alogi* were finally put to rest.

To understand this fascinating rise in the *Alogi*'s significance and its role in the so-called 'Johannine Controversy' it is necessary to account for the full range of primary evidence and how scholarship over the past century has arranged these disparate pieces to create such a narrative. One of the most surprising aspects of such an investigation is that none of the evidence on its own supports this tidy summary of the church's battle over the Johannine literature. However, when taken together, numerous pieces of evidence spanning over a millennium have been arranged to seemingly support this grand narrative. Whether or not such a configuration is valid is the central question at hand.

Although Epiphanius alone claims to know all of the particulars of the *Alogi*, other sources that span over a millennium may have made implicit references to this group. What follows is a catalogue of these lost and extant primary sources along with necessary comments and explanations. The first of these sources comes from the earliest staunch defender and advocate of the Fourth Gospel, Irenaeus.

---

1 Cf. Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy*, 207.

### 1.1 Irenaeus

The Bishop of Lyons never mentions the *Alogi* directly; however, he makes two brief comments that have been interpreted as implying his knowledge of this heresy. The first comes from his work *Against Heresies* in which he describes a group who rejected both the Paraclete and the Fourth Gospel. There are clear parallels between Irenaeus' comments and Epiphanius' final description of the *Alogi* (*Haer.* 51.35.1–3) such that the two seem to be linked.<sup>2</sup>

Others (*Alii*), indeed, in order to frustrate the gift of the Spirit, which in the most recent times—according to the pleasure of the Father—was poured out on the human race, do not admit that appearance in the Gospel of John, where the Lord promised that he would send the Paraclete; but they reject both the Gospel and the Prophetic Spirit. Wretched men indeed, who want<sup>3</sup> to be false prophets, they in fact reject the prophetic grace from the Church, just like those who—on account of those who come in hypocrisy—also abstain from communion with the brethren. I understand, moreover, that those of this kind (also) do not accept the Apostle Paul; for in that epistle which is to the Corinthians, prophetic gifts are mentioned, and he (Paul) knows men and women prophesying in the Church. Sinning against the Spirit of God in all these things, therefore, they fall into the irremissible sin (Mt. 12:32; *AH* 3.11.9).<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Chapter 7.3.

<sup>3</sup> Many scholars have proposed amending the Latin text by replacing the word '*nolunt*' for '*uolunt*', thus: '*qui pseudoprophetas quidem esse nolunt*' ('they do *not* wish to be false prophets'). Other emendations include transposing '*pseudoprophetas*' for '*pseudoprophetae*'. These emendations are generally proposed to clarify a reading of Irenaeus that presumes the prophetic Spirit is a reference to the Montanist Paraclete. J.D. Smith, Jr., who does not believe any emendations are necessary, states the issue well: if Irenaeus is referring to a group of anti-Montanists in this passage, 'Why would such persons desire to be prophets at all, especially false prophets, since it is this very audacious activity with respect to the prophetic charisma which is suspect to them and has resulted in their own repudiation of the Gospel of John?' Smith, 'Gaius,' 147. For a summary of scholarly positions on various emendations, see Bludau, 31ff.; Pierre de Labriolle, *La Crise, Montanisme* (Paris: Ernst Leroux, 1913), 234ff. Although such a textual amendment is entirely understandable and possibly reflects the original text, I have chosen to preserve the standard Latin reading because the transmitted text is comprehensible and coherent as it stands.

<sup>4</sup> Latin text from A. Rousseau and L. Doutreleau, *Irénée de Lyon: Contre les Hérésies*, Livre III. SC 211 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1974), 170–2.

The second piece of evidence from Irenaeus' writings comes at the end of another work, *Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching*. Here he references another anonymous group, which some have linked with the similarly unidentified *Alii* of *AH* 3.11.9.<sup>5</sup>

Others do not accept the gifts of the Holy Spirit, and repudiate the prophetic charisma which enables men to bring forth the fruit of divine life. These are those of whom Isaiah (Is. 1:30) said, "You shall become like a terebinth stripped of its leaves, and like a garden that has no water." These are good for nothing to God for they are incapable of bearing fruit (*Dem.* 99).<sup>6</sup>

## 1.2 Hippolytus of Rome

In contrast to the evidence from Irenaeus, that from Hippolytus is far less straightforward. As such, the supposed link between Hippolytus and Epiphanius requires elaboration. Although Epiphanius is often criticized as being over reliant upon Hippolytus, the surviving evidence that directly links the latter with the former's account of the *Alogi* is slim. Nevertheless, there are two key pieces of evidence (both of which are now lost) that are often touted as undeniable proof that Hippolytus knew and refuted the *Alogi*.

First, in 1865, Lipsius was the first to argue for the reliance of Epiphanius, Philaster of Brescia and Ps.-Tertullian upon a common document (*Grundschrift*), presumed to be Hippolytus' lost *Syntagma Against Thirty-Two Heresies*, noted by Photius (*Bibl.* 121).<sup>7</sup> There is, however, no indication from corroborating sources that the *Alogi* was included in Hippolytus' *Syntagma*; nor was it listed in Hippolytus' extant work *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium* (*Elenchos*). Lipsius himself excluded the *Alogi* from his reconstructed *Syntagma* although others assumed its presence.<sup>8</sup> There is, however, another major piece of evidence that may indicate Hippolytus wrote against this sect.

Secondly, and perhaps the most compelling piece of evidence to support the notion that Hippolytus refuted the *Alogi* is the title of his work, *ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατὰ Ἰωάννην εὐαγγελίου καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως* listed on the back of the plinth of

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Smith, 'Gaius', 163; Campenhausen, 239, n. 159.

<sup>6</sup> Tr. from Campenhausen, 239, n. 159.

<sup>7</sup> R.A. Lipsius, *Zur Quellenkritik des Epiphanius* (Vienna: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1865), 16–32. The *Syntagma* is also mentioned in *Chronicon Paschale* 8.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Chapter 5.2.

the statue of Hippolytus in Rome.<sup>9</sup> Although many scholars have argued that this work may have been foundational to Epiphanius' account<sup>10</sup> it has not survived, thus relegating any link between it and Epiphanius' *Alogi* to the realm of conjecture.<sup>11</sup>

### 1.3 Gaius of Rome

The only primary evidence that comes from the hand of Gaius of Rome is preserved by Eusebius of Caesarea, and this comes by way of a number of decontextualized fragments.<sup>12</sup> Indeed, Eusebius only employs the words of Gaius when they conveniently serve his own purposes.<sup>13</sup> The work cited in the *Historia Ecclesiastica* is the *Dialogue with Proclus*, a polemical treatise against a leader of the New Prophecy, composed during the episcopate of Zephyrinus (ca. 198/9–217 AD). A few certifiable facts may be derived from these fragments: Gaius was in Rome, he was an anti-Montanist, and he rejected the 'scriptural' status of Montanist writings.

But I (Gaius) have the trophies of the apostles to show (you), for if you (Proclus) were to go to the Vatican or the Ostian Way, you will find the trophies of those who established this church. (*HE* 2.25.7)

Gaius, whose words are quoted earlier, in his disputation, investigates these things concerning this man [Cerinthus]. He writes, 'But also Cerinthus, who through revelations (ἀποκαλύψεων) as if having been written by a great apostle (ἀποστόλου μεγάλου), introduces marvellous stories to us that he falsely claims have been given to him by angels,

9 For images of the Statue, see the Plates provided in Brent, *Hippolytus*, XIII–XXXVI.

10 Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers* i, 2 (London: Macmillan & Co., 1890), 394–5 (hereafter *AF*); Theodore H. Robinson, 'The Authorship of the Muratorian Canon', *The Expositor* 7.1 (1906): 494; Smith, 'Gaius', 209; Bludau, 165; and Prigent, 'Hippolyte, commentateur de l'Apocalypse', *TZ* 28 (1972), 407–412. Labriolle argued that Epiphanius used either (or both) the Hippolytan work *Heads against Gaius*, noted by the later Syrian writer Ebed-Jesu, and *Defense of the Gospel etc.* in his chapter on the *Alogi*. (Pierre de Labriolle, *Les Sources De l'Histoire Du Montanisme* [Paris: Ernst Leroux, 1913], LXXI).

11 The issue of Epiphanius' dependence upon Hippolytus is significant and will be addressed more fully in Chapter 5.2.

12 Chapter 3.2 provides additional details from other sources that reference Gaius of Rome, but as these are primarily dependent upon Eusebius, they are not included here.

13 Cf. T. Scott Manor, 'Proclus, the North African Montanist?' *Studia Patristica* LXV (2013): 139–146.

saying after the resurrection there will come an earthly kingdom of Christ, and that flesh dwelling in Jerusalem will again be enslaved to desires and pleasures. And being hostile to the scriptures of God, desiring to lead [others] astray, he says there will be a thousand years for marriage festivities.' (HE 3.28.1b-3)<sup>14</sup>

Although the following citation is from Proclus—perhaps in response to Gaius' claim of the 'trophies' (above)—it should be noted here as one of the few fragments of Gaius' *Dialogue* that still exists.

After him<sup>15</sup> there were four prophetesses, the daughters of Philip, at Hierapolis in Asia. Their tomb is there and the tomb of their father. (HE 3.31.4)

As far as Eusebius' estimation of Gaius, we are told he was an 'ecclesiastical man' (ἐκκλησιαστικὸς ἀνὴρ, HE 2.25.6) and a 'very learned man' (λογιωτάτου ἀνδρός, HE 6.20.3).

#### 1.4 Origen

In his *Commentary on John*, Origen emphasizes the discrepancies among the gospels in an effort to demonstrate the need for his allegorical exegesis. Because the *Alogi* also criticized the Gospel of John for not aligning with the Synoptic Gospels, and given some parallels between the criticisms of Origen and the *Alogi*, it has been frequently noted that Origen's work is a clear allusion to the 'Johannine Controversy'.

They say—those who accept the four Gospels and who suppose that the discrepancy (διαφωνίαν) is not to be resolved through anagogical interpretation (διὰ τῆς ἀναγωγῆς)—they will have to explain the difficulty noted beforehand, about the forty days of the temptation, a period for which there is no room that can be found in the account of John, (and) when the Lord came into Capernaum . . . But if we ask when Christ was in Capernaum the first time, they will say to us, according to the words of Matthew and the other two, it was after the temptation, when 'leaving

<sup>14</sup> GCS 9,1, 256–8.

<sup>15</sup> Because Eusebius excludes the earlier portions of this statement, the referent of 'him' is unknown.

Nazareth He came and stayed in Capernaum next to the sea.' But how can they claim both the account of Matthew and Mark be true—that it was on account of Him hearing that John was delivered up that he withdrew into Galilee—and that according to John, [which states] after a number of other events than just His stay at Capernaum alone, namely His going up to Jerusalem, and His journey from there to Judea, that John was not yet cast into prison, but was baptizing in the Aenon near Salim?" And there are many other points where, if someone carefully scrutinizes the Gospels concerning their historical disagreement, (τὰ εὐαγγέλια περὶ τῆς κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν)—we will try to present each as they happen, insofar as we are able—he will surely become dizzy and will either shrink from confirming the Gospels as true, and choose one of them at random since he would not dare to deny completely the faith concerning our Lord, or accept that there are four <and inquire> that their truth is not to be found in the outward characteristics (σωματικοὺς χαρακτῆρσιν; *Comm. Jo.* 10.2).<sup>16</sup>

Later, in the same book, Origen provides some additional comments that have been compared with Epiphanius' comments on the *Alogi*.

I have cited lengthy sections from the Gospels, but I think it has been necessary to do so in order to render the stated discrepancy. Three Gospels place these events, which are assumed to be the same as those written by John, as occurring in *one* journey of the Lord to Jerusalem. But John places them in connection with *two* visits, which are divided from each other, in between which there were many acts of the Lord and journeys made to other places. Therefore, I find it impossible for those who accept nothing other than the history in their interpretation to admit that these discrepancies are in agreement. And if someone thinks that we have not provided a sound exposition, let him produce an intelligent rebuttal to our view (*Comm. Jo.* 10.15).<sup>17</sup>

## 1.5 Dionysius of Alexandria

Of course, the *Alogi* rejected not only the Fourth Gospel, but the Apocalypse as well. Without a doubt the clearest and most viable connection between

16 Cécile Blanc, *Origène, Commentaire sur Saint Jean. Tome II (Livres VI et X)*. SC 157 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1970), 386–390. Cf. Epiphanius, *Haer.* 51.18.6.

17 Emphases mine. SC 157, 464. Cf. Chapter 8.



Epiphanius' testimony regarding the Apocalypse and the early extant literature is the testimony of Dionysius of Alexandria, as preserved by Eusebius. Dionysius takes a non-literal interpretation of the Apocalypse. It is wrong, he claims, to think that there will be a thousand years of bodily pleasures that will contain eating and drinking and marrying in an earthly Jerusalem (*HE* 7.25.1–3). Furthermore, he attributes this view to Cerinthus. This is how Eusebius records the words of Dionysius:

Some before us (τινὲς...πρὸ ἡμῶν) have set aside (ἡθέτησαν) and dismantled (ἀνεσκέυασαν) the whole book, amending (διευθύνοντες) each chapter, and displaying it as unintelligible (ἄγνωστόν) and illogical, and maintaining that the title is a lie. For they say (λέγουσιν) that it is not from John, nor is it a revelation because it is covered thickly and deeply by a curtain of ignorance (ἄγνοίας). And they say that none of the apostles, neither the saints, nor anyone in the church wrote it, but that Cerinthus, who founded the sect, which is called the Cerinthians after him, desiring trustworthy authority for his own forgeries, assigned the name. (*HE* 7.25.1–2)<sup>18</sup>

## 1.6 Epiphanius of Salamis

In the last quarter of the fourth century Epiphanius compiled his list of eighty heresies along with his own refutations, or antidotes, to the 'bites' of these snake-like sects. The account of the *Alogi* is far too lengthy to fully reproduce here, but the most notable sections are provided below. He opens his account of the *Alogi* in this way:

Therefore these *Alogi* (Ἄλογοι)—for this is the name I am giving to them. From now on, they shall be so called, beloved. We shall call them this name, these *Alogi*, for they held to the heresy for which [that] name <was worthy>: they rejected the books of John. Since they do not accept the Word, which John has preached, they will be called *Alogi*. Being absolute strangers to the message of truth, they deny the purity of the message and accept neither the Gospel of John nor the Apocalypse. And if they accepted the Gospel, but rejected the Apocalypse, we would say they are doing it on account of precision—not accepting an 'apocryphon' because of the deep and dark sayings in the Apocalypse. But when they do not

<sup>18</sup> *GCs* 6,2, 690. Cf. Chapter 10.3.

receive the books which are preached from Saint John, it is clear to everyone that they and those like them are those concerning whom Saint John said in his general epistles, 'It is the last hour, and you heard that the Antichrist is coming and now behold there are many Antichrists' (1 Jn. 2:16). . . . For they say that these works are not from John but Cerinthus and are not worthy to be affirmed in the Church (*Haer.* 51.3.1–6).<sup>19</sup>

And it can be shown from this hostility that, 'They neither understand what they are saying nor what they maintain strongly' (1 Tim. 1:7). For how can the words against Cerinthus be by Cerinthus? Cerinthus says that Christ is 'recent' and only a man, but John has proclaimed that [Christ] is the eternal Word who has come from on high and been made flesh. Therefore their frivolous attack has been put to shame as a false accusation and unaware from where it is refuted. For they appear to believe as we do, but not holding to the certainties that are from God revealed to us through Saint John, they will be convicted of shouting against the truth about things that they do not know. They will be known to them, if they return to sobriety of mind and knowingly understand; for we are not rejecting the teachings of the Holy Spirit, which are important and authoritative (*Haer.* 51.4.1–4).<sup>20</sup>

In his lengthy portrayal and refutation of this sect, he presents two primary arguments of the *Alogi* against the Gospel of John and three against the Apocalypse. The first objection concerns the fact that the Gospel of John does not record the forty-day temptation, whereas the Synoptics do. This objection is divided into two parts (*Haer.* 51.4.5–10; 51.17.11–18.6). The second objection to the Gospel of John is much more succinct and concerns the discrepancy in the number of Passovers that John record as compared to the Synoptics (*Haer.* 51.22.1).

### 1.6.1 *Objection 1—Gospel of John*

For they say against themselves—I do not say against the truth—that [John's] books do not agree (ὁυ συμφωνεῖ) with the other apostles'. And now they believe they can attack the holy and inspired teachings. "And what did he say?" he asserts (φησὶν). "In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God and the word was God." And that, 'The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we knew his glory,

19 GCS 31,2 *Epiphanius II*, 250–1.

20 GCS 31,2 *Epiphanius II*, 251.

glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.” And immediately, “John bore witness and cried, saying, ‘This is the one of whom I was telling you.’” And that “This is the lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world.”

And next [John] says, “And those that heard him said, ‘Rabbi, where do you dwell?’” and in the same breath he says, “in the morning Jesus wanted to go into Galilee and found Philip and Jesus said to him, ‘Follow me.’” And after a little while he says, “And after three days there was a wedding in Cana of Galilee, and Jesus was called, and his disciples, to the wedding supper, and his mother was there.” But the other evangelists say that he spent forty days in the wilderness being tempted by the devil, and then returned to choose his disciples. And they [the *Alogi*] have not seen that each evangelist has taken care to say what the others had said, in agreement with them, while at the same time revealing what each had not proclaimed, but had neglected to disclose. For the will was not their own: but the sequence (ἀκολουθία,) and teachings came from the Holy Spirit. If these opponents attack these writings [of John], they must learn that the other three of these [Gospels] did not begin in the same way (*Haer.* 51.4.5–12a).<sup>21</sup>

Epiphanius then provides a lengthy rebuttal to this initial criticism before picking up the second half of this first objection, which reads:

Not understanding the power of the Gospels they say, “Why have the other evangelists said that Jesus fled from before Herod to Egypt, and after the flight he came back and remained in Nazareth; then, after receiving the baptism, went up into the wilderness, and returned after these things, and after his return began to preach? But the Gospel which was issued under John’s name lies,” they say (φασί). For, after it says that “The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us” and a few other things, immediately it says that there was a wedding in Cana of Galilee (*Haer.* 51.17.11–18.1).<sup>22</sup>

But they say that the Gospel according to John is non-canonical (ἄδιδόκετον) because it did not mention these things—I am speaking about the events of the forty-day temptation—and they do not deem it worthy of being accepted, since they are deceived about everything and mentally blind (*Haer.* 51.18.6).<sup>23</sup>

<sup>21</sup> GCS 31,2 *Epiphanius* II, 251–2.

<sup>22</sup> GCS 31,2 *Epiphanius* II, 274–5.

<sup>23</sup> GCS 31,2 *Epiphanius* II, 275–6.

### 1.6.2 *Objection 2—Gospel of John*

But they accuse the holy evangelist again, more so the Gospel itself, because, he says (φησίν), 'John said that the Savior kept two Passovers over a period of two years, but the other evangelists describe one Passover' (*Haer.* 51.22.1).<sup>24</sup>

Towards the end of his account, Epiphanius records the three objections that the *Alogi* had against the Apocalypse of John.

### 1.6.3 *Objection 1—Apocalypse*

And again these people are not ashamed to take up arms against the things said by Saint John, believing that they are able to overturn the truth, but being unaware that they are attacking themselves rather than sound teachings. For they say mockingly of the Apocalypse, 'What use is it to me, he says (τί με, φησίν), when the Apocalypse of John tells me about seven angels and seven trumpets?'—not knowing that such things were essential and profitable to the correctness of the proclamation" (*Haer.* 51.32.1–3; cf. *Rev.* 8:2).<sup>25</sup>

### 1.6.4 *Objection 2—Apocalypse*

Again some of them attack the following text in the Apocalypse and say in contradiction that 'He said, in a contradiction, 'Write to the angel of the church that is in Thyatira,' and there is no church of Christians in Thyatira. How then did he write to a church that does not exist?' In fact these people destroy themselves since they are compelled by their own declarations to confess the truth. For if they say, 'There is now no church in Thyatira,' they show that this was foretold by John.

For since those who are of the Phrygians settled there [and] grabbed the minds of the simple believers like wolves, and converted the whole area to their heresy, those that reject the Apocalypse attacked this text at that time in an effort to discredit it (*Haer.* 51.33.1–3; *Rev.* 2:18).<sup>26</sup>

<sup>24</sup> GCS 31,2 *Epiphanius II*, 283.

<sup>25</sup> GCS 31,2 *Epiphanius II*, 305.

<sup>26</sup> GCS 31,2 *Epiphanius II*, 306–7.

### 1.6.5 *Objection 3—Apocalypse*

But again these people get excited in their boundless hunt for texts to give the notion of throwing out the books of the holy apostle—I mean the Gospel and Apocalypse of John (and perhaps the Epistles also, for these are also in accord with the Gospel and Apocalypse)—and they say (φασιν) that, ‘I saw, and he said to the angel, “Loose the four angels that are upon the Euphrates.” And I heard the number of the host, ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands, and they had been fortified in breastplates of fire and sulfur and hyacinth.’ (Rev. 9:14–17) For these people considered that the truth might somehow be <a kind of> joke (*Haer.* 51.34.1–3a).<sup>27</sup>

At the end of his account, Epiphanius summarizes the sins of the *Alogi* in this way:

But since these people have not received the Holy Spirit they are judged for not observing the things of the Spirit, and being willing to speak against the words of the Spirit. They do not see the gifts of grace in the holy Church, which, with understanding and a sound mind, the Holy Spirit set out in detail, so also the holy apostles, and the holy prophets have followed truly and vigorously. Among these, St. John has given his gracious gift to the holy church, through the Gospel, the Epistles and Revelation. But as it is said, ‘He who blasphemes against the Holy Spirit, it will not be forgiven him, neither in this age nor in the one to come.’ (Mt. 12:32) For they have also waged war against the words spoken by the Spirit (*Haer.* 51.35.1–3).<sup>28</sup>

This account represents the earliest extant evidence of any opposition to the Fourth Gospel *and* the Apocalypse. As noted above, others such as Philaster of Brescia later followed Epiphanius’ notice of a group that rejected the Gospel and Apocalypse of John. None of these sources, however, provided any further details than what has been catalogued thus far. This all changed in the late nineteenth century, however, when one scholar stumbled across a commentary from a writer who was active seven centuries earlier. The incorporation of this evidence would drastically change the way many interpreted the earlier evidence.

<sup>27</sup> GCS 31,2 *Epiphanius* II, 308–9.

<sup>28</sup> GCS 31,2 *Epiphanius* II, 310–11.

## 1.7 Dionysius bar Salibi

In 1888 the Irish scholar John Gwynn published some fragments of the *Commentary on the Apocalypse, Acts and Epistles*, written by the twelfth-century Jacobite Bishop of Amid, Dionysius bar Salibi (d. 1171).<sup>29</sup> Although bar Salibi's work makes no mention of the *Alogi*, it does identify another figure of the early church as a Johannine antagonist who, in a debate with a certain *Hippolytus Romanus*, offered similar objections to those of the *Alogi* against the Apocalypse. Bar Salibi identifies this person only as 'Gaius', and since Eusebius mentions a certain 'Gaius of Rome' who was active around the same time as Hippolytus, the two quickly became linked.

In this putative debate between Hippolytus and Gaius the 'heretic', the latter offers five objections against the Apocalypse based on its incompatibility with other scripture.<sup>30</sup>

### 1.7.1 *Objection 1*

*Gaius' objection to Rev. 8:8, concerning the notice that a great mountain will be cast into the sea and a third of the sea became blood.*

On this, Caius the heretic objected to this revelation, and said that it is not possible that these things should be, inasmuch as, '*as a thief that cometh in the night, so is the coming of the Lord*' (1 Thess. 5:2).<sup>31</sup>

### 1.7.2 *Objection 2*

*Gaius' objection to Rev. 8:12, concerning the notice that the third part of the sun was darkened, and the third part of the moon, and the third part of the stars.*

On this Caius said that, Just as in the Flood the heavenly bodies were not taken away and suddenly submerged, thus also is it to be in the end, as it

29 John Gwynn, 'Hippolytus and his 'Heads against Caius',' *Hermathena*. A Series of Papers on Literature, Science and Philosophy, by Members of Trinity College, Dublin. Vol. 6 (1888), 397–418. Bar Salibi's work on the Apocalypse is published in its entirety by Sedlacek, I. (ed.) *Dionysius Bar Salibî. In Apocalypsim, Actus et Epistulas catholicas*. CSCO 60. Scriptores Syri. Versio. Series Secunda. Tomus CI. Romae: Excudebat Karolus de Luigi, 1910. Hereafter referred to as *Comm. Apoc.*

30 The list of Gaius' objections and Hippolytus' rejoinders is found in Gwynn, pp. 399–404.

31 *Comm. Apoc.*, 8; cf. Gwynn, 399. *Caius haereticus impugnavit hanc visionem et dixit: Impossibile est, ut ista fiant, nam, «sicut fur, qui venit noctu», ita erit adventus Domini.*

is written (Mt. 24:37); and Paul says, *When they shall say, Peace and safety, destruction shall come upon them* (1 Thess. 5:3).<sup>32</sup>

### 1.7.3 *Objection 3*

*Gaius' objection to Rev. 9:2–3, concerning the notice that locusts came out of the smoke and were given power like the power of scorpions on the earth.*

Here Caius objects, how will the unrighteous be consumed by the locusts, when Scripture says that *sinner prosper* and the righteous are persecuted, *in the world* (Ps. 73:12); and Paul, that the faithful *shall be persecuted and the evil shall flourish, being deceived and deceiving* (11 Tim. 3:12–13)?<sup>33</sup>

### 1.7.4 *Objection 4*

*Gaius' objection to Rev. 9:15, concerning the angels, which are loosed to slay a third of mankind.*

On this Caius says: It is not written that angels are to make war, nor that a third part of men is to perish; but that *nation shall rise against nation* (Mt. 24:7).<sup>34</sup>

### 1.7.5 *Objection 5*

*Gaius' objection to Rev. 20:2–3, concerning the notice that Satan will be bound for a thousand years.*

On this Caius the heretic objects: that Satan is bound here, according to that which is written, that Christ *Went into the strong man's house and bound him, and seized us who were his goods* (Mt. 12:29).<sup>35</sup>

32 *Comm. Apoc.*, 9; cf. Gwynn, 400. Caius dixit: *Sicut in diluvio elementa non sublevata sunt, et subito aquis submersa sunt, ita etiam in fine erit, sicut scriptum est; et Paulus: «cum dicent: Salus est et securitas, surget in eos interitus».*

33 *Comm. Apoc.* 10; cf. Gwynn, 401. hic obiicit Caius: *Quomodo scelesti percutientur locustis, cum dicat Scriptura peccatores prosperaturos et iustos persecutioni obnoxios fore in mundo; et Paulus: «Fideles persecutionem patientur et mali prospere agent, errantes et decipientes»?*

34 *Comm. Apoc.* 10; cf. Gwynn, 402. Caius (dicit): *Non est scriptum angelos bellum gessuros esse, nec tertiam partem hominum perituram esse, sed: «Surget gens contra gentem».*

35 *Comm. Apoc.* 19; cf. Gwynn, 402–3. Caius haereticus obiicit: *Satanas hic victus est secundum quod scriptum est: «Ingressus est Christus domum fortis et ligavit eum et rapuit nos, vasa eius».*

Gwynn noticed that Gaius' fourth objection concerning whether the angels mentioned are to be released to slay the third of mankind (Rev. 9:15), was almost identical to one of the arguments lodged by the *Alogi* (*Haer.* 51.34.2–8).<sup>36</sup> In addition, both Epiphanius and Hippolytus make the same appeal to Deut. 32:7–9 as justification in their rebuttals.<sup>37</sup> The implication was clear: there must be some connection between the source(s) of bar Salibi's commentary and Epiphanius' account of the *Alogi*. Either Epiphanius and bar Salibi were dependent upon the same Hippolytan work, or perhaps bar Salibi simply altered the testimony of Epiphanius and provided missing information that connected the *Alogi* with Gaius of Rome. Gwynn was drawn to the former and concluded that a Hippolytan work entitled *Heads Against Gaius*, mentioned only in the *Catalogue* of Ebed-Jesu (below), was the common source of both.<sup>38</sup>

Yet a full connection between Gaius and the *Alogi* was missing one crucial element: the bar Salibi commentary in Gwynn's hands only recorded Gaius' rejection of the Apocalypse, whereas the *Alogi* rejected the Gospel of John as well. In fact, Gwynn argued that Gaius could *not* be identified with the *Alogi* because it appears he was receptive of the Gospel of John. This is seen in Hippolytus' replies to the first and final charges of Gaius against the Apocalypse where he cites the Gospel of John (11:10, 12:35–36; 14:30), 'evidently as an authority admitted by his opponent.'<sup>39</sup> Furthermore, Gwynn noted that none of the criticisms of Gaius demonstrate that he 'went to such lengths in his condemnation of the Apocalypse as to assign it to Cerinthus.'<sup>40</sup> According to Eusebius, in his *Dialogue with Proclus*, Gaius opposed Cerinthus' carnal chiliasm as expressed in an apocalyptic work that Cerinthus falsified under the name of a 'great apostle' (*HE* 3.28.1–2). Is this a reference to John's Apocalypse? For Gwynn, if Gaius had actually gone so far as to attribute this work to Cerinthus, surely Hippolytus and bar Salibi would have included and refuted such a position. Thus, the absence of any such reference led Gwynn to

---

36 Gwynn, 402, 406–7; *Comm. Apoc.*, 10.

37 Gwynn, 406–7. Cf. *Haer.* 51.34.5–7; *Comm. Apoc.* 10.

38 Hippolytus' *Heads Against Gaius* was, according to Gwynn, a distinct work from another work listed in the *Catalogue* of Ebed-Jesu entitled, *Defense of the Gospel and Apocalypse according to John*. *Ibid.*, 404–5.

39 Gwynn, 406; *Comm. Apoc.* 8, 19.

40 Gwynn, 408–9.



conclude that Gaius could not have attributed the Johannine Apocalypse to Cerinthus, as had the *Alogi* (*Haer.* 51.3.6).<sup>41</sup>

However, shortly after Gwynn's publication, J. Rendell Harris and T.H. Robinson provided additional bar Salibi materials that indicated Gaius probably rejected the Gospel of John as well as the Apocalypse. Harris discovered some manuscripts of the bar Salibi commentary on the Gospel of John, while Robinson stumbled upon a separate copy of bar Salibi's commentary on the Apocalypse that contained a portion of the prologue that was missing from Gwynn's copy of the same work.

Here is the extract of Harris' discovery of a Latin translation of bar Salibi's commentary on the Gospel of John made by Dudley Loftus:

*Gaius haereticus reprehendat Johannem quia non concors fuit cum sociis, dicentibus, quod post baptismum abiit in Galilaeam, et fecit miraculum vini in Katna. Sanctus Hippolytus e contrario* (l. adversus eum) scilicet . . .<sup>42</sup>

*A heretic Gaius rebukes John because he was not in agreement with his companions, since after the baptism he went into Galilee, and made the miracle of wine in Cana. Saint Hippolytus said against him . . .*

Harris noted a significant corruption in the manuscript tradition, however. After reviewing two manuscripts of the same work, housed in the British Library (MSS Codd. Add. 7184 and 12,143), Harris suspected that 'the name of Gaius was not in the primitive draft of the Commentary.'<sup>43</sup> In MS. Add. 7184 the text reads: 'A certain heretic had accused John . . .' above which a later hand prescribed the name Gaius. The second British manuscript (MS. Add. 12,143) contains the same objection but with no mention of the name 'Gaius' at all. In

41 Ibid., 405–6. Shortly after Gwynn's publication, Adolf von Harnack also argued that Gaius did not reject John or ascribe it to Cerinthus, only that he may have utilized elements of the *Alogi*'s arguments against Revelation. Adolf von Harnack, *Das Neue Testament um das Jahr 200* (Freiburg: J.C.B. Mohr, 1889), 63ff.

42 J. Rendell Harris, 'Presbyter Gaius and the Fourth Gospel.' In *Hermas in Arcadia and Other Essays*, 43–59 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896): 48. See Harris (48) for the full reproduction of Hippolytus' response in the Latin. Harris located this Latin translation by Dudley Loftus in the Bodleian Library, *Fell MSS.* 6 and 7, which Loftus translated from the Syriac MS listed in the Manuscripts Department of Trinity College Library, Dublin as: TCD MS 1512 fol. Chart., s.xii. Syriac—Dionysius (Jacob) Barsalibi; *Commentarius in Quator Evangelia. Written by Matthew, son of John, for his nephew Matthew, son of Bakhititujar, A. Gr. 1509; AD 198.*

43 Harris, 48.

the words of Harris, 'as we can see no reason for the omission of the name of Gaius in these two copies, we suspect that it has come in by editorial correction. Indeed the opening words which answer to the Greek αἵρετικὸς τις would of themselves suggest the absence of the name of the heretic.'<sup>44</sup> However, given that this anonymous objection is followed by a rebuttal by Hippolytus, as in the case of the objections to the Apocalypse, Harris maintained Gaius' name was rightly added by a later source for the sake of identification.

It did not take long for the third and final piece of 'new' evidence from the bar Salibi commentaries to arrive. In 1906, T.H. Robinson published an article in which he argued that Hippolytus was the author of the *Muratorian Fragment*.<sup>45</sup> This conclusion was based on Robinson's assumption that Epiphanius was wholly reliant upon a *singular* work of Hippolytus, as Harris had suggested. Robinson also argued that the defense of the Gospel of John recorded in the *Muratorian Fragment* is too similar to the response of Hippolytus against Gaius to deny that the *Muratorian Fragment* is a product of Hippolytus as well.<sup>46</sup> To prove this, Robinson published the introduction to bar Salibi's *Commentary on the Apocalypse*, which had been missing from Gwynn's copy of the same work.<sup>47</sup> In this recovered portion one finds an historical introduction in which Gaius is portrayed as clearly rejecting *both* the Gospel and Apocalypse of John and attributing both to Cerinthus.<sup>48</sup> As to where bar Salibi got this information, Robinson concluded that the law of parsimony of causes necessitates that all of bar Salibi's quotations must have come directly from Hippolytus' *Defense of the Apocalypse and Gospel of John*.<sup>49</sup>

... At the beginning of the treatise we must say that there are many teachers who are in doubt regarding the Revelation of John, and say that it is not his. And Eusebius of Caesarea declares the same thing in his ecclesiastical writings. For Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, says that the Revelation was not that of John the Apostle, but of another John, 'the Presbyter,' who lived in Asia. The reason is, that the style of the Revelation is not like the

---

44 Ibid., 48–9.

45 Robinson, 'Authorship,' 481–495.

46 Ibid., 494–5.

47 See Gwynn, 410.

48 Robinson (487) translated the preface to bar Salibi's work, which includes this statement: 'Hippolytus of Rome states that a man named Gaius had appeared, who said that neither the Gospel nor yet the Revelation was John's; but that they were the work of Cerinthus the heretic.'

49 Ibid., 491.

type of the language of the Gospel. Also John makes no mention of his name at all in the Gospel, but does put his name at the beginning and end of the Revelation. Now we agree that he received the Revelation of which he wrote from our Lord. Irenaeus the bishop, and Hippolytus of Bozra say that the Revelation is that of John the Evangelist, and that it was granted about the end of the reign of Domitian. And Eusebius of Caesarea agrees with this, but immediately says that some do not accept it as being the Revelation of John the Apostle, so saying that it is the work of John the Elder, who was a contemporary of John the Apostle. And there are two tombs in Asia, one being that of the Evangelist, the other that of John the Elder.

Hippolytus of Rome states that a man named Gaius had appeared, who said that neither the Gospel nor yet the Revelation was John's; but that they were the work of Cerinthus the heretic. And the blessed Hippolytus opposed this Gaius, and showed that the teaching of John in the Gospel and Revelation was different from that of Cerinthus. This Cerinthus was one who taught circumcision, and was angry with Paul when he did not circumcise Titus, and the Apostle calls him and his disciples in one of his letters 'sham apostles, crafty workers.' Again he teaches that the world was created by angels, and that our Lord was not born of a virgin. He also teaches carnal eating and drinking, and many other blasphemies. The Gospel and Revelation of John, however, are like the teaching which the Scriptures contain; and so they are liars who say that the Revelation is not by the Apostle John. And we agree with Hippolytus that the Revelation is the Evangelist John's. This is attested by S. Cyril and Mar Severus, and all the teachers who bring evidence from it. Also the Theologian,<sup>50</sup> in his 'Address to the Nation,' testifies that there is no proof from the conclusion, and says, 'as John taught me by his Revelation; He made a way for thy people, and these stones'—where he calls the heretics and their teaching stones.<sup>51</sup>

Later, in the middle of the twentieth century, thanks to the contributions of M. Chabot towards the critical editions of the bar Salibi commentaries, Pierre de Labriolle was made aware of another copy of bar Salibi's commentary on the Gospels in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. This manuscript (*Cod. parisinus syr.* 67) contains the name 'Gaius' as part of the original text. Labriolle cites it in this way:

50 Robinson understands this figure to be Gregory of Nazianzus.

51 Robinson, 487. Latin translation in Sedlacek (ed.), *Comm. Apoc.* 1–2.

*Caius hareticus arguebat Iohannem* quod non consentiret Evangelistis eius sociis qui dicunt (*sic*) quod post baptismum iuit in Galileam et fecit Canae miraculum uini.<sup>52</sup>

It is readily apparent that another textual issue arises, though not pertaining to the inclusion of Gaius' name. The translation of this manuscript reads incoherently:

*Gaius the heretic accused John* because it does not agree with the other Evangelists who say (pl.) that after the baptism he came into Galilee and made the miracle of the wine in Cana.

In fact this is the Johannine chronology, not that of the Synoptics as is indicated in this passage. Labriolle suggested the original reading must have read, '... dicunt quod post baptismum iuit <in desertum, dum ipse dicit quod statim iuit> in Galileam, etc...'<sup>53</sup> Labriolle also noted that another copy of the bar Salibi commentary (*Cod. Paris. syr.* 68) neglected to include the objection of Gaius altogether. He also referenced a relatively recent copy (1904) of a seventeenth-century manuscript that provides a text analogous to that of *Cod. parisinus syr.* 67, which includes Gaius' name.

## 1.8 Ebed-Jesu

The last major piece of evidence comes from the Syriac *Catalogue* of Ebed-Jesu (*ca.* 1300). The seventh chapter of this work lists a number of works by 'Hippolytus, bishop and martyr' (*Hippolytus Episcopus & Martyr*). Lightfoot translated the entry into Greek, Assemani into Latin.<sup>54</sup>

Lightfoot Translation

Assemani Translation

Κύριος Ἰππόλυτος μάρτυς

1 *Sanctus Hippolytus martyr*

52 Labriolle, *Crise*, 285, citing *Cod. parisinus syr.* 67 Fol. 270, r<sup>o</sup>, col. 2. Not surprisingly, Smith based his translation on this manuscript due to its inclusion of Gaius' name. See Smith, 'Gaius', 201, n. 2.

53 Labriolle, *Crise*, 285, n. 1

54 Lightfoot, *AF* i, 2, 350. See also J.S. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis Clementino-Vaticana*, tomi tertii pars prima Romae (Rome: S.C. Propaganda Fide 1719–1728) 111.1, 15.

καὶ ἐπίσκοπος ἔγραψε βιβλίον περὶ οἰκονομίας καὶ ἐρμηνείαν	2 <i>Et Episcopus composuit librum De Dispensatione: &amp; expositionem</i>
Δανιήλ τοῦ μικροῦ καὶ Σουσάννας	3 <i>Danielis minoris &amp; Susannae</i>
καὶ κεφάλαια κατὰ Γαῖου καὶ ἀπολογίαν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως	4 <i>Et capita adversus Cajum:</i> 5 <i>Et Apologiam pro Apocalypsi</i>
καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰωάννου [sic] τοῦ ἀποστόλου καὶ εὐαγγελιστοῦ.	<i>Et Evangelio Joannis Apostoli &amp; Evangelistae</i>

Blessed Hippolytus, martyr and bishop wrote a book concerning the interpretation of *Little (or 'Young') Daniel* and *Susannah*, and *Heads (or 'Chapters') against Gaius*, and an *Apology* for the Apocalypse and Gospel of John, Apostle and Evangelist.

With the addition of this last piece of evidence, the preceding entries in the catalogue of evidence concerning the *Alogi* and Gaius would seem to fall in place. Ebed-Jesu's *Catalogue* appears to acknowledge the existence not only of the lost work inscribed on the plinth of the Statue of Hippolytus, but also the unknown source that informed the commentaries of bar Salibi. Although the *Alogi* are not mentioned, the parallels between Gaius' criticisms and those of the *Alogi* would steer scholarship throughout most of the twentieth century towards the conclusion that the former mounted an ecclesiastical campaign against the Johannine literature. The following chapter will outline in greater detail this trajectory of scholarship.

## An Implausible Consensus and a New Way Forward

Prior to Gwynn's discovery of the bar Salibi commentaries, just as little was known about Gaius of Rome as was known of the *Alogi*. In fact, shortly before Gwynn's publication, J.B. Lightfoot went so far as to question the historical existence of Gaius, hypothesizing that he was nothing more than a fictitious character invented by Hippolytus for dramatic purposes in his polemic against the Montanists—perhaps even a double of Hippolytus himself.<sup>1</sup> Lightfoot's clever hypothesis was based on the fact that Eusebius is the only early witness to Gaius and his attacks on the Montanist Proclus (*HE* 2.25.6–7; 3.28.1–2; 3.31.4; 6.20.3). Since Eusebius knows of Gaius only through what must have been an anonymous copy of the anti-Montanist work entitled *Dialogue with Proclus*, Lightfoot argued that he incorrectly assumed that because Gaius is the main protagonist of this work he must also be its author. He concluded it is more likely that this work, as with many of the particulars of Gaius, should be predicated to Hippolytus, thus eliminating Gaius as an historical figure.

Gwynn's discovery appeared not only to disprove Lightfoot's hypothesis by securing the historical existence of Gaius of Rome, but also to add to the Gaius' legacy by providing new information of his refusal to accept the Apocalypse as canonical.<sup>2</sup> Ironically, Gaius of Rome, once venerated by Eusebius as an 'ecclesiastical man' (ἐκκλησιαστικὸς ἀνὴρ, *HE* 2.25.6) and a 'very learned man' (λογιωτάτου ἀνδρός, *HE* 6.20.3) of good—if not prominent—standing within the early church, was now cast as a 'heretic' by Dionysius bar Salibi.<sup>3</sup> It is at this point that scholarship began re-examining the earliest evidence through the lens of the bar Salibi commentaries. The following summary of scholarship over the past century describes the evolution of the once-inconsequential

1 J.B. Lightfoot, 'Caius or Hippolytus?' *Journal of Philology* 1, no. 1 (1868): 98–112. See also *AF* i, 2, 377ff.

2 In response to Gwynn's discovery Lightfoot conceded the falsity of his hypothesis, but did not entirely let go of his position. 'Gaius therefore is alive once more, though he seemed to me to be dead. But, whether this is really Gaius the Roman presbyter or another, may perhaps still be an open question.' Lightfoot, *AF* i, 2, 388.

3 Dionysius bar Salibi refers to 'Caius haereticus' in the first and fifth objections raised by Gaius against the Apocalypse of John. See Gwynn, 399, 402; *Comm. Apoc.* 8, 19. In contrast, Photius goes so far as to suggest that Gaius was a presbyter of the church in Rome and was ordained 'bishop of the Gentiles' (*Bibl.* 48).

*Alogi* and Gaius of Rome to the point where they became the epicentre of the 'Johannine Controversy'.

## 2.1 The Formation of a Consensus

### 2.1.1 *Eduard Schwartz*

In a series of three articles written in the early twentieth century, Eduard Schwartz provided fresh insights into the discussion of Gaius of Rome and the opposition to the Johannine writings.<sup>4</sup> The first two articles linked Epiphanius' *Alogi* with the unnamed opponents of the Gospel of John and the Prophetic Spirit mentioned by Irenaeus (*AH* 3.11.9).<sup>5</sup> For Schwartz, Irenaeus' use of the plural 'others' (*Alii*), along with Epiphanius' *Alogi*, does not necessitate that this opposition to the Johannine writings indicated numerous opponents. Rather, Schwartz argued the plural form was a common stylistic device used in the polemical genre in which both Irenaeus and Epiphanius wrote. Based on this analysis, Schwartz further concluded that there is no doubt that the opposition to the Gospel and Apocalypse of John was limited to one person: Gaius of Rome.<sup>6</sup>

Hippolytus, a pupil of Irenaeus, was therefore the intermediary to Epiphanius and the source for his knowledge of the opposition to the Johannine writings. Moreover, Schwartz argued that because Irenaeus was responding to the criticisms of Gaius, Eusebius' testimony of the date of Gaius' *Dialogue* during the reign of Zephyrinus (199–217 AD; cf. *HE* 2.25.6; 6.20.3) must have been erroneous.<sup>7</sup> In his opinion, around 160 AD one could still refuse the Fourth Gospel and avoid excommunication; thus Gaius' *Dialogue with Proclus* must have been written around this time.

Despite the fact that Schwartz was unaware of Harris' discovery of bar Salibi's commentary on the Gospel of John, his analysis of the Syriac fragments of bar Salibi's commentary on Revelation led him to the conclusion that Gaius

4 Eduard Schwartz, 'Über den Tod der Söhne Zebedaei: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Johannesevangeliums,' *Abhandlungen d. Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wiss.*, N.F. VII, 5 (1904): 3–53; 'Noch einmal der Tod der Söhne Zebedaei,' *ZNW*, 11 (1910): 89–104; 'Johannes und Kerinthos,' *ZNW* 15 (1914): 210–219. The first and third articles are located in Eduard Schwartz, *Gesammelte Schriften*, v (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1963), 48–123 and 170–182 respectively. Pagination references correspond to the original publications.

5 See esp. Schwartz, 'Über den Tod,' 30.

6 *Ibid.*, 40, 44; Schwartz, 'Noch einmal,' 99.

7 Schwartz, 'Über den Tod,' 40ff.

must have rejected the Gospel of John as well.<sup>8</sup> This is based largely on the similarity in style between the objections raised by the *Alogi* in Epiphanius and Gaius in the commentary of bar Salibi.<sup>9</sup> Schwartz hypothesized that Eusebius did not mention Gaius' rejection of the Gospel of John due to the fact that he had an incomplete copy of the *Dialogue* in which this criticism was deleted.<sup>10</sup>

Finally, Schwartz found further evidence of orthodox backlash against Gaius in the writings of other early writers. For example, he drew parallels between the *Alogi's* criticisms and the arguments of Origen concerning the discrepancies in the chronology of Christ's ministry recorded in the Gospel of John as compared to that found in the Synoptics (*Comm. Jo.* 10). Schwartz argued that since Gaius was the sole member of the *Alogi*, Origen's response is, in fact, his own polemic against Gaius. In addition, Schwartz argued that it is not unlikely that Eusebius' discussion of the order in which the Gospels were written (*HE* 3.24) was directed at the criticisms that originated from Gaius, although Eusebius was not aware that Gaius was at the core of this opposition.<sup>11</sup>

In his third article, however, Schwartz modified and retracted some of his previous positions.<sup>12</sup> Most notably, Schwartz no longer held that Gaius rejected the Gospel of John, nor did he uphold his earlier view that Gaius was to be identified with the *Alogi*. Gaius, independent of this heretical group, based his attacks on the Johannine Apocalypse from a previous second-century, anti-Montanist work that rejected both the Gospel and Apocalypse of John. The existence of such a work, however, is pure conjecture. Nevertheless, Schwartz maintained that Gaius only rejected the Johannine Apocalypse, which was not an uncommon position in the early third century. Likewise, Epiphanius utilized the same hypothetical work in his description of the *Alogi*, who wanted to take away the apostolic foundation for the Montanist doctrine of the Paraclete and thus ascribed Revelation to Cerinthus. The Gospel of John, guilty by authorial association, was therefore ascribed to Cerinthus as well.<sup>13</sup>

As with Gaius and Epiphanius, Hippolytus himself is indebted to this previous, hypothetical work, which, along with Gaius' *Dialogue with Proclus*, served as a foundation for his two distinct treatises: the *Defense of the Gospel of John*

---

8 Ibid., 36. Schwartz translated the Syriac fragments of bar Salibi's commentary on Revelation back into Greek, as it is the only 'scientific' and 'permissible' language for this type of analysis.

9 Ibid., 36ff.

10 Ibid., 42.

11 Ibid., 44–5.

12 Schwartz, 'Johannes und Kerinthos,' 210–19.

13 Ibid., 213–4.



and *Revelation* as well as the *Heads against Gaius*.<sup>14</sup> Furthermore, Schwartz abandoned his previous dating of Gaius' *Dialogue with Proclus* and adopted Eusebius' dating during the time of Zephyrinus.<sup>15</sup> For Schwartz, the *Alogi* existed independent of and prior to Gaius of Rome.

### 2.1.2 August Bludau

In 1925, August Bludau composed a comprehensive study focused squarely on the evidence to support the view that would become known as the 'Johannine Controversy'.<sup>16</sup> Some of his conclusions fell in step with those of Schwartz and others, however his analysis also raised important questions regarding the way in which scholars were calibrating the evidence.

Bludau agreed that Irenaeus' anonymous *Alīi* in *AH* 3.11.9 must have been a group of anti-Montanists that rejected the Gospel of John, but there is nothing to suggest that the Apocalypse was also included.<sup>17</sup> Thus, Irenaeus was *not* referring to the *Alogi*. Furthermore, he concluded that Gaius of Rome was to be distinguished from the *Alogi* as well, particularly because there is nothing to indicate that the *Alogi* were anti-Montanists.<sup>18</sup> However, in his *Dialogue with Proclus*, Gaius did utilize the arguments of the *Alogi*, which preceded him.<sup>19</sup> Also, contra Schwartz's earlier view, Epiphanius clearly portrays this heresy as more than a single individual, thus eliminating the possibility of Gaius being the only member of the *Alogi*.<sup>20</sup>

As to the source(s) for Epiphanius' testimony, Bludau pointed to Hippolytus, based on bar Salibi's testimony.<sup>21</sup> Because neither the *Alogi* nor Gaius are mentioned in any of his extant works, Hippolytus must have composed two different apologetic works later in his life: one against the *Alogi* (*Apology*) and one against Gaius (*Heads against Gaius*). Whether or not these two works are related is unclear.<sup>22</sup> It is certain, however, that Epiphanius did not conceive of Gaius as the *Alogi*, thus he used Hippolytus' *Apology*, not the *Heads against Gaius*, as his source.

14 Ibid.

15 Ibid., 212.

16 A. Bludau, *Die ersten Gegner der Johannesschriften*. Biblische Studien 22 (Freiburg: Herder and Co., 1925).

17 Ibid., 39–40.

18 Ibid., 120.

19 Ibid., 165.

20 Ibid., 222–3.

21 Ibid., 150ff.

22 Ibid., 165; cf. 184–5.

### 2.1.3 *Walter Bauer, J.N. Sanders, R.M. Grant, and Hans von Campenhausen*

In 1934, Walter Bauer added a new dimension to the study of Gaius of Rome.<sup>23</sup> In his work, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, he did not give particular attention to the details surrounding the numerous dimensions of the study of the *Alogi* upon which previous scholars had focused. Rather, he was content to amalgamate prior scholarship into a tidy summary of Gaius and the *Alogi* that fit squarely within his overall purpose, which was to demonstrate that early Christianity was far more diverse and complex in nature than the traditional narrative suggests.

Bauer argued that Gaius of Rome 'vigorously' rejected the Fourth Gospel and is 'closely connected' with Epiphanius' *Alogi*. Irenaeus was also aware of this group around 175 AD (*AH* 3.11.9), even if Gaius was not a member of the *Alogi* at that time. The reason why Gaius was not condemned as a heretic at this point suggested to Bauer that it was permissible for a Roman Christian—and in this case an officeholder—to consider the Apocalypse and Gospel of John as forgeries of Cerinthus.<sup>24</sup> Bauer held that Gaius personified the general mood of early orthodoxy in Rome towards the Fourth Gospel, which manifested its reticence through silence and explicit rejection. It was the association of the Gospel of John with Montanism and Gnosticism that caused Gaius, the *Alogi*, and the orthodox community in Rome to reject it. In fact, 'history is unable to name a single orthodox Roman for whom the Fourth Gospel had been of any significance' until Irenaeus defended its apostolicity without reservation.<sup>25</sup>

J.N. Sanders echoed much of the overall analysis of Walter Bauer in his work, *The Gospel of John in the Early Church*.<sup>26</sup> At the foundation of Sanders' argument was the notion that the Gospel of John originated in Alexandria and bore proto-gnostic elements that were intended to resonate with people inclined towards such religious speculation, but the Gospel was eventually exploited by Alexandrian and Valentinian gnostics such as Basilides, Ptolemy, Heracleon, and Valentinus in the second century in order to validate the apostolic heritage

23 Walter Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1934), ET, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, eds. Robert A. Kraft and Gerhard Krodel (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971).

24 *Ibid.*, 207.

25 *Ibid.*, 208.

26 J.N. Sanders, *The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1943).

of their teachings.<sup>27</sup> Gaius and the conservative *Alogi* essentially conceded the validity of the Valentinian exegesis of the Gospel of John in their rejection of the Gospel and attribution of it to the 'early Gnostic Cerinthus'. It was left to Irenaeus to demonstrate the legitimacy of the orthodox *kerygma* within the Gospel and its usefulness as a weapon against the Gnostics and the *Alogi* (implied in *AH* 3.11.9) by means of superior exegesis.<sup>28</sup> Rome was the epicentre of orthodox reticence towards accepting the Gospel of John and Revelation and the 'headquarters' of the *Alogi*.

Shortly thereafter, Robert M. Grant<sup>29</sup> continued the trend of interpreting Irenaeus' statements (*AH* 3.11.9) as demonstrating the fact that Eusebius wrongly dated Gaius during the reign of Zephyrinus.<sup>30</sup> For Grant, the Roman orthodox group, the *Alogi*, is to be identified with Gaius, who staunchly upheld the position of Roman orthodoxy and its triad of gospels against the Gospel of John and the threatening views of the Gnostics, Montanists and Quartodecimans with which it was associated.<sup>31</sup> He argued that Gaius rejected the Gospel of John in the *Dialogue* and *Heads against Gaius* alike, and that Eusebius did not provide a full, accurate series of quotations.<sup>32</sup> Furthermore, the testimony of Eusebius proves that yet another early church figure, Dionysius of Alexandria, made use of Gaius' *Dialogue* in his work *On the Promises* (*HE* 7.25.1–3). Grant argued that Cerinthus' Christology does not agree with the chiliasm of the Johannine Apocalypse and that the theories of Gaius concerning the authenticity of the Gospel of John and the Apocalypse were 'simply anti-Montanist propaganda'.<sup>33</sup> Irenaeus, Hippolytus and the *Muratorian Fragment* demonstrate the judgment that was eventually pronounced on Gaius: 'The church had spoken; Gaius' defence of an outmoded orthodoxy was henceforth heretical.'<sup>34</sup>

27 Sanders later argued for a Syrian followed by an Ephesian origin of the Gospel of John in J.N. Sanders, *The Foundations of the Christian Faith* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1951), 161–2 and *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John*, ed. B.A. Mastin (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1969), respectively.

28 Sanders, *Fourth Gospel*, 65–6, 85.

29 R.M. Grant, 'The Fourth Gospel and the Church,' *HTR* 35, no. 2 (April 1942): 95–116 and 'The Origin of the Fourth Gospel,' *JBL* 69, no. 4 (December 1950): 305–322.

30 Grant would later modify this position, noting that Gaius post-dated Irenaeus. See R.M. Grant, *Heresy and Criticism: The Search for Authenticity in Early Christian Literature*, (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993), 93.

31 Grant, 'Fourth Gospel,' 109; 'Origin,' 307.

32 Grant, 'Fourth Gospel,' 109, n. 85.

33 Grant, 'Origin,' 310.

34 Grant, 'Fourth Gospel and the Church,' 110.

However, not everyone believed the Johannine Controversy was a Roman phenomenon; Hans von Campenhausen argued that it probably originated in Asia Minor.<sup>35</sup> He also broke with the view that Eusebius' dating of Gaius was wrong. Campenhausen adhered to the Eusebian dating of Gaius during the time of Zephyrinus, and argued that Gaius was merely attempting to dismantle Irenaeus' four-fold Gospel canon. Thus, Irenaeus is not to be considered a 'relevant source' since he predates Gaius, who was 'a respected theologian' and certainly not the first spokesperson of Roman orthodoxy to attribute the Johannine writings to Cerinthus, even if the reasons for this particular attribution 'can hardly be determined with certainty.'<sup>36</sup> Nevertheless, the *Alogi* had only one member: Gaius of Rome.<sup>37</sup>

#### 2.1.4 *Joseph Daniel Smith, Jr.*

The sustained progression towards the identification of Epiphanius' *Alogi* with Gaius of Rome culminated in 1979 with the Ph.D. dissertation of Joseph Daniel Smith, Jr.<sup>38</sup> The scope of Smith's analysis is exhaustive and his conclusions echo the views many scholars before him, particularly Schwartz's original position. Until now his unpublished dissertation remains the most thorough examination of the evidence concerning the *Alogi* and Gaius of Rome, and it is still considered by some to be authoritative.<sup>39</sup>

Smith argued that there is an interrelationship between the earlier testimonies of Irenaeus, Dionysius of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, Epiphanius and others. These can be calibrated to suggest that Gaius stood alone in his opposition to the Gospel and Apocalypse of John and is the sole figure behind the enigmatic heretical 'group' Epiphanius refers to as the *Alogi*. The glue that holds all these pieces together is the later testimonies of Dionysius bar Salibi and Ebed-Jesu.

First, Smith maintained that Irenaeus' defence of the four-fold gospel was in response, at least in part, to the arguments of Gaius (*AH* 3.11.9).<sup>40</sup> Irenaeus did not specifically name him because Gaius was situated within the orthodox camp, not demonstrably 'heretical' as were the Valentinians or Marcion, whom

35 Hans von Campenhausen, *The Formation of the Christian Bible*. Trans. L.A. Garrard. (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1972), 238.

36 *Ibid.*, 240., n. 164; 239, n. 161.

37 *Ibid.*, 239, n. 163; 240, n. 164.

38 Joseph Daniel Smith, Jr. 'Gaius and the Controversy over the Johannine Literature' (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1979).

39 See Culpepper, *John*, 121.

40 Smith, 'Gaius,' 141–68.

Irenaeus mentions earlier in this passage.<sup>41</sup> Because Irenaeus is attacking those who wish to impugn the Gospel of John as a result of its use by another (anonymous) group of individuals to validate their claims of the prophetic spirit, the context suggests these *Alii* were an anti-Montanist faction within the church that reacted sharply against the 'extreme, exaggerated and fanatical claims to the possession of the Spirit and prophetic gifts by the Montanists.'<sup>42</sup> Yet Smith had a number of obstacles to overcome in his identification of Gaius with Irenaeus' *Alii*.

He faced the same problem as Schwartz in that Eusebius Gaius during the time of Zephyrinus (199–217 AD; *HE* 2.25.6–7; 3.31.4), whereas Irenaeus' *Against Heresies* is generally dated between 170–180 AD. Either Eusebius was wrong in his dating of Gaius, or Irenaeus was somehow aware of Gaius' anti-Montanist, anti-Johannine stance well before Gaius wrote his *Dialogue with Proclus*. Smith took the middle ground, suggesting that Irenaeus must have known the oral tradition of Gaius before the compositions of the *Dialogue with Proclus*.<sup>43</sup> He also followed Schwartz in arguing that Irenaeus' use of the plural *Alii* (*AH* 3.11.9), along with Epiphanius' *Alogi* (*Haer.* 51), does not necessitate that this opposition to the Johannine writings indicated a multiplicity of opponents.<sup>44</sup>

Another problem arises in that nowhere does Irenaeus mention that this group rejected John's Apocalypse. To overcome this, Smith argued that Irenaeus *could* have insinuated a rejection of the Johannine Apocalypse in the phrase, '... but set aside at once both the gospel and the *prophetic Spirit*' (cf. e.g. Rev. 19:10, 22:6).<sup>45</sup> This would, of course, force 'prophetic spirit' to have a *double entendre*: the Paraclete and a cryptic reference to the Johannine Apocalypse. Despite his reluctance in associating *spiritum propheticum* with the Johannine Apocalypse,<sup>46</sup> Smith nevertheless saw fit to presume Irenaeus had intended

41 Ibid., 168. See also Stanton, 202; Schwartz, 'Über den Tod,' 3–53.

42 Smith, 'Gaius,' 159. Smith is correct in noting that Irenaeus is *not* referring to a group of Montanists in this passage, as suggested by various nineteenth-century writers, including A. Roberts and J. Donaldson, eds. *Ante-Nice Christian Library: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to AD 325*. 5 Vols., 1 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1868), 295f. See further the discussion in Bludau, 13–27 and Smith, 'Gaius,' 153ff.

43 The identical conclusion was reached by Grant, 'Origin,' 307.

44 Smith, 'Gaius,' 223. See Schwartz, 'Über den Tod,' 40, 44; 'Noch einmal,' 99. Cf. Bludau, 222–3.

45 '... sed simil et Evangelium et propheticum repellunt Spiritum.'

46 '... it is questionable whether the text can sustain such an interpretation,' Smith, 'Gaius,' 143, n. 3. Stanton (202) argued that it is 'probable' that this group also opposed the Apocalypse.

this double meaning.<sup>47</sup> This is confirmed by his interpretation of Eusebius (*HE* 3.28.1–2), in which Smith believes Gaius rejected the Johannine Apocalypse and ascribed it to Cerinthus.<sup>48</sup> He argued that Eusebius included Gaius' testimony because of his own disdain for the book, which he describes as having questionable content and dubious authorship (cf. *HE* 3.24–25, 3.39.6).<sup>49</sup> Similarly, Dionysius of Alexandria, whom Eusebius quotes immediately after Gaius' statements (*HE* 3.28.3–5; cf. 7.25.1–3), used Gaius' *Dialogue with Proclus* as the source for his attack against yet another anonymous group that attributed the Johannine Apocalypse to Cerinthus.<sup>50</sup> This group is likely to include, if not solely consist of Gaius.<sup>51</sup> Thus, both Eusebius and Dionysius of Alexandria knew that Gaius rejected Revelation in his *Dialogue* and apparently attributed it to Cerinthus.<sup>52</sup>

Smith also agreed with Schwartz that Origen was indirectly responding to Gaius' arguments against the Gospel of John in his *Commentary on John* (*Comm. Jo.* 10.1–3).<sup>53</sup> Thus nearly every extant witness to *any* explicit or implicit anti-Johannine sentiments from the testimonies of Irenaeus (ca. 175 AD), Origen (ca. 225–230 AD), Dionysius of Alexandria (ca. 250–255 AD), Eusebius (ca. 324–325 AD) and Epiphanius (ca. 374–377 AD) implicate *Gaius alone* in his rejection of *both* the Gospel and Apocalypse of John.

The foundation for Smith's conclusions is the major assumption that all the sources that speak of Gaius and/or the *Alogi* are entirely dependent upon Gaius' *Dialogue with Proclus* or Hippolytus' *Defense of the Gospel of John and Revelation*, the latter supposedly being the same as the work *Heads against Gaius*.<sup>54</sup> The exception to this necessary dependence on the writings of Gaius or Hippolytus is, of course, Irenaeus. By limiting the presumed source(s) of all knowledge of the Johannine opposition to Gaius and/or Hippolytus, Smith was able to strategically limit the scope of possibilities for identifying who

47 Smith, 'Gaius,' 168. Smith was preceded in this notion by B.H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1927), 438.

48 Smith, 'Gaius,' 182. Smith follows the lead of Hans von Campenhausen (*Formation* 241, n. 181), who argued that 'There can be no doubt that Gaius does here have the Revelation of John in mind,' not a distinct Apocalyptic writing from Cerinthus' own hand. See also Bludau, 40–60; Gwynn, 398.

49 Smith, 'Gaius,' 191–2.

50 Ibid., 184–190. See also Chapman, 57.

51 Smith, 'Gaius,' 188.

52 Ibid., 190.

53 Ibid., 195–6. See also Schwartz, 'Über den Tod,' 44–5; cf. 'Johannes und Kerinthos,' 213–4.

54 Smith, 'Gaius,' 264, 136f., 225–6.

comprised this anti-Johannine faction. Inevitably this would point to Gaius of Rome.<sup>55</sup>

Smith's work hinges entirely on the viability of the above premise; otherwise his entire thesis would disintegrate. That is, if Hippolytus had, in fact, written *two* treatises, Epiphanius could have utilized one of Hippolytus' treatises (*viz.* the *Defense of the Apocalypse and Gospel of John*) for his description of the *Alogi*, and Hippolytus could have crafted his polemic against Gaius in a separate treatise (*viz.* the *Heads against Gaius*), of which Epiphanius may have been unaware.<sup>56</sup> But, Smith relied on the same presumption as other scholars that these two works were singular in nature.<sup>57</sup> He claimed that possibility of two works is 'hardly plausible', because '[t]he duplication would be entirely unnecessary.'<sup>58</sup>

Smith concludes his work by claiming, '*The name "Alogi" is entirely a fictitious fabrication by Epiphanius himself and in no way does it represent an historical group. There is only one known so called "Alogi" who rejected the Gospel of John and Revelation and denied that John the Disciple was the author, and he is the historical Gaius of Rome.*'<sup>59</sup> He emphatically denies that this means that Gaius is to be considered as a figure of disdain or reproach in the early church. Rather, he sought to 'rehabilitate' Gaius as an early 'orthodox and venerated ecclesiastical leader' of the church in Rome at the dawn of the third century. Gaius was a biblical critic and scholar, whose contributions greatly impacted the history of the canon, the history of biblical interpretation, the history of doctrine and

55 'If this conclusion stands the test, then all knowledge of an opposition to the Johannine writings ultimately goes back to Gaius himself or to his *Dialogue with Proclus*.' Smith, 'Gaius,' 227.

56 Smith, 'Gaius,' 223ff.

57 Lightfoot noted, 'The *Heads Against Gaius* are mentioned in the list of Ebedjesu as a separate work. But they have every appearance of being extracts from that part of this apologetic work which relates to the Apocalypse' [*viz.* *Defense of the Apocalypse*...]. Lightfoot, *AF* i. 2, 395. See also Harris, 46f.; Carl Schmidt, 'Exkurs 1: Der Gnostiker Kerinth. Die Aloger,' in *Gespräche Jesu Mit Seinen Jüngern Nach Der Auferstehung* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1919), 447; Robinson, 491. In addition, Smith argues (366) that the structure of this singular work was comprised of three sections: a defense of the Gospel of John, a defense of Revelation, and a refutation against Cerinthus.

58 Smith, 'Gaius,' 427, 429, 226.

59 *Ibid.*, 427 (italics those of Smith); see also 137, 265–6. Smith's conclusion had been repeatedly articulated by a number of previous scholars including Schwartz, 'Über den Tod,' 40, 44; 'Noch einmal,' 99; Pierre Ladeuze, 'Caius de Rome, le seul Aloge connu,' in *Mélanges Godefroid Kurth* (Liege: Sonderabdruck, 1908), 49–60; Chapman, 53, n. 1; R.M. Grant, 'Fourth Gospel,' 109; *ibid.*, 'Origin,' 307.



the history of the institution of the church.<sup>60</sup> He also argued that Gaius' rejection of the Johannine writings was 'merely incidental' to his main focus, which was the growing Montanist presence in Rome. 'Gaius was unequivocally on the side of orthodoxy and viewed his treatise against Montanism the *Dialogue with Proclus*, including the opposition to the Johannine writings, as being in the service of the church at Rome.'<sup>61</sup>

In summary, the scholarly consensus over the past century has evolved to support the following positions: (i) Gaius is to be identified, at least in part, with Epiphanius' *Alogi*;<sup>62</sup> (ii) Gaius and the *Alogi* rejected both the Apocalypse and Gospel of John as non-apostolic;<sup>63</sup> (iii) Irenaeus was referring to some form of the anti-Montanist, anti-Johannine phenomenon of the *Alogi* (and Gaius) in his defense of the Gospel of John (*AH* 3.11.9);<sup>64</sup> (iv) the opposition to the Johannine writings by the *Alogi* and the ecclesiastical Gaius is indicative of the overall attitude of Roman orthodoxy towards a 'tainted' gospel;<sup>65</sup> (v) Epiphanius and Dionysius bar Salibi were both dependent on the same

---

60 Smith, 'Gaius,' 425–37.

61 Ibid., 429.

62 E.g., ibid., 427; Pierre Ladeuze, 'Caius de Rome, le seul Aloge connu.' In *Mélanges Godefroid Kurth*, 49–60. Vol. 2 (Liège: Sonderabdruck, 1908); 50; D.A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, (Cambridge: W.B. Eerdmans, 1991), 28; Haenchen, 18ff.; R.M. Grant, *Heresy and Criticism*, 97; Williams, trans., *The Panarion* Vol. 1, 28, n. 9. R.A. Culpepper agrees completely with the work of Smith, noting that, 'Recent scholarship has therefore dismissed the Alogoi from the stage of history. We have no evidence for such a group. The figure of Gaius has emerged with greater clarity, however.' Culpepper, *John*, 122. See also the apparatus in Karl Holl and Jürgen Dummer (eds.), *GCS 31,2 Epiphanius II: Panarion haer. 34–64* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1980), 251–2.

63 E.g., Smith, 'Gaius,' 429; B. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin Development and Significance*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), 104–105; R.E. Heine, 'Role of the Gospel of John in the Montanist Controversy,' *Second Century* 6 (1987), 14; Haenchen, 18, 23; Hengel, *Johannine Question*, 5; *Four Gospels*, 21; D.M. Smith, 'The Problem of John and the Synoptics in Light of the Relation Between Apocryphal and Canonical Gospels,' in *John and the Synoptics* ed. A. Denaux BETL 101 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 157.

64 E.g., Smith, 'Gaius,' 168; Culpepper, *John*, 121; G.M. Hahneman, *The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 102; Haenchen, 23–4; Hengel, *Johannine Question*, 5; cf. *Four Gospels*, 12, 21; Campenhausen, *Formation*, 238–9, n. 159. Perhaps Smith too hastily concluded that, 'All evidence of criticisms against the Gospel of John and Revelation, their rejection, and denial of apostolic authorship can be traced back to Gaius of Rome and to no other person or group.' Smith, 'Gaius,' 427.

65 E.g., Smith, 'Gaius,' 427; Culpepper, *John*, 121; Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 137–8; cf. Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy*, 207–8.



source for their information, which must have been a work of Hippolytus that is now lost;<sup>66</sup> (vi) and the more peripheral conclusion based largely on the works of Walter Bauer, J.N. Sanders and R.M. Grant, although dismissed by Smith, that the orthodox anti-Johannine response of the *Alogi* and Gaius was linked to anti-Gnostic sentiments.<sup>67</sup>

It is important to recognize that the most crucial element to this formulation is the cache of extracts in the writings of Dionysius bar Salibi. And whereas a majority of scholars are apt to take these later testimonies as reliable, two works have raised serious questions regarding their reliability and their portrayal of the early ecclesiastical opposition to the Johannine literature.

## 2.2 Challenges to the Consensus

### 2.2.1 Allen Brent

The first work to devote substantial attention to questioning the veracity of the bar Salibi statements and the resulting connection of Gaius and the *Alogi* came in the form of Allen Brent's work on Hippolytus.<sup>68</sup> Brent concludes that there is no reason to assume that bar Salibi was reliant upon a lost Hippolytan polemical work against Gaius. Rather, he likely drew his information from a florilegium, thus rendering the supposed conflict between Gaius and Hippolytus as a product of bar Salibi's editorializing, not an actual encounter. To prove this, Brent points to a variety of eastern pseudepigrapha in which Hippolytus'

66 E.g., T.H. Robinson, 489; Pierre de Labriolle, *Sources*, LXIX–LXXVI; Grant, 'Fourth Gospel,' 108–9; Campenhausen, *Formation*, 236–42; Smith, 'Gaius,' 196–204, 222–8; Haenchen, 23; Culpepper, *John*, 122. Cf. Aline Pourkier, who takes a more conservative approach to this question in *L'Hérésiologie Chez Épiphanes de Salamine* Christianisme Antique 4 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1992), 105.

67 Sanders, *Fourth Gospel*, 65–6, 85; Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy*, 107–109; R.M. Grant, 'Fourth Gospel,' 108ff. See also Stanton, 404f.; Haenchen, 23–4; Hengel, *Johannine Question*, 5ff.; Hahneman, 102; R. Brown, *The Epistles of John*, (New York: Doubleday, 1982), 113f.; J.J. Gunther, 'Early Identifications of Authorship of the Johannine Writings,' *JEH* 31 (1980), 427. The early perspective of Adolf von Harnack suggested that the argument of the *Alogi* for Cerinthian authorship of the Gospel of John demonstrates the fact that they considered the Gospel of John to be a gnostic document with a Docetic christology, and that they were intently opposed to Gnosticism. See A. von Harnack, 'Die Gwynn'schen Cajus-und Hippolytus-Fragmente,' *TU* (1890), 121–123. For a full summary of scholarship on early orthodox 'Johannophobia' see Hill, *Johannine Corpus*, 13–55.

68 A. Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church in the Third Century: Communities in Tension before the Emergence of a Monarch-Bishop*. VCSupp 31. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

name is used as an unhistorical literary character engaged in various polemical dialogues.<sup>69</sup>

Regarding the Hippolytan work *Heads against Gaius*, Brent suggests that Ebed-Jesu simply deduced the existence of such a work from reading bar Salibi's *Commentary on the Apocalypse*.<sup>70</sup> 'Both external and internal considerations preclude it from being anything else than a general exegetical tradition dressed up pseudepigraphically under the cipher-names of "Hippolytus" and "Gaius".'<sup>71</sup> As such, the similar work on the statue should not be read as an apology.

Ultimately, the original source for the criticisms that bar Salibi attributes to Gaius is Epiphanius. Notably, Brent argued that the *Alogi* were not an historical group;<sup>72</sup> rather, he notes that Epiphanius 'succeeded in uniting a disparate group of objectors and objections into a composite heresy called the "Ἀλογοί".'<sup>73</sup> According to Brent, Epiphanius created the *Alogi* by 'grouping under this one term disparate groups of people not necessarily doctrinally united, such as the Montanists alone.'<sup>74</sup> Thus, rather than identifying Gaius as the only member of the *Alogi*, Brent argues that bar Salibi and Ebed-Jesu are dependent upon the development of tradition that has its roots ultimately in the testimony of Epiphanius, not Hippolytus.

Brent's conclusion, if correct, has significant bearing on the question of the history and significance of the *Alogi*. However, given that the focus of his work was primarily on questions surrounding the Hippolytan corpus, not directly on the *Alogi*, he stops short of developing which sources Epiphanius may have used.<sup>75</sup> However, another recent challenger to the consensus view has begun this important task.

---

69 Ibid., 178.

70 Ibid., 170–4. Here, Brent follows the view of P. Nautin. *Le dossier d'Hippolyte et de Méliton dans les florilèges dogmatiques et chez les historiens modernes*. Patristica I. (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1953), 146.

71 Brent, *Hippolytus*, 184.

72 Prior to Brent, Campenhausen (*Formation*, 242) notes this possibility, noting briefly that Epiphanius 'makes up some tale about a formal sect of anti-Johannists.' He nevertheless continues to maintain that Gaius was still one of the members of this group.

73 Brent, 173.

74 Ibid., 140.

75 Ibid., 143. Brent only suggests that these may have included Porphyry, Celsus and Philosabbatius, whom Epiphanius names in *Haer.* 51.8.1.

### 2.2.2 Charles E. Hill

In his work *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church*, Charles E. Hill<sup>76</sup> has offered tentative support to the arguments of Brent concerning the *Alogi*. He suggests, 'If Brent is correct, the entire edifice of opposition to the Fourth Gospel based around Gaius of Rome completely implodes, leaving scarcely a trace. But is he correct?'<sup>77</sup> Following Brent, Hill develops some strategic avenues to discern the sources that Epiphanius used in the creation of this sect. First, there is no doubt that Irenaeus influenced Epiphanius' testimony. Hill is right in pointing to the notice of Irenaeus (*AH* 3.11.9) as a foundational source of Epiphanius' testimony. Epiphanius (*Haer.* 51.23.3–4) also shows reliance upon Irenaeus' comments on the Valentinians' view that their number of celestial Aeons corresponds to the age of Jesus at his death (*AH* 2.22.3).

In addition to Irenaeus, Hill finds aspects of Eusebius' account of the origins of the Gospel of John (*HE* 3.24.5–17) in Epiphanius' testimony, as well as the more notable influence of Origen. Hill has initiated a rather compelling case that Epiphanius may have drawn the criticisms of the *Alogi* from Origen's *Commentary on John*.<sup>78</sup>

Hill's brief analysis of Epiphanius' testimony is extremely valuable in locating which sources may have comprised the aggregate *Alogi*. It is, however, limited in scope. He does not survey the possible sources for Epiphanius' testimony regarding the criticisms of the Apocalypse, nor does he recognize various other aspects of the account of the *Alogi* that derives from the writings of Epiphanius' predecessors. Hill also stops short of any detailed analysis of the bar Salibi commentaries or the *Catalogue* of Ebed-Jesu, which have dominated the discussion of the *Alogi* for over a century.

Thus, from Hill's perspective, Brent 'scores some very important points' and 'may be correct overall,'<sup>79</sup> but his support is tempered with a degree of caution. 'It is understandable that some may want to withhold full endorsement of Brent's position, pending further studies.'<sup>80</sup> It is true that the complexities of the evidence surrounding the *Alogi* extend well beyond the recent analyses of Brent and Hill; however, their works have provided an important contribution and counterpoint to the consensus view regarding the *Alogi* and the early ecclesiastical sentiments toward the Johannine corpus.

76 C.E. Hill, *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

77 *Ibid.*, 186.

78 Cf. *ibid.*, 186–90.

79 *Ibid.*, 186.

80 *Ibid.*, 191.

### 2.3 The Fall of the Consensus?

At present, there are two distinct ways of viewing the history and significance of the *Alogi*. On the one hand, many scholars continue to uphold the consensus view that this heretical group represents the negative sentiments of the early church towards the Johannine writings. On the other hand, there have emerged a handful of scholars that questions whether the influence of the *Alogi* in the early church extends beyond the imagination of Epiphanius. In both instances, there is more to the story than the version told by proponents of the consensus view as articulated by Smith as well as that which Brent and Hill have postulated. Although the consensus view still has much traction, it cannot be ignored that the questions of its viability as well as a fresh look at the evidence, which might suggest an equally (if not more) plausible narrative that tells a very different story, has done serious damage to the chorus of scholarly assessments over the past century. It remains true, however, that if an alternative narrative is warranted it must begin afresh with a new way forward.

### 2.4 A New Way Forward

It is a curious feature of scholarship over the past century that a good number of scholars have sought to locate the sources of Epiphanius' *Alogi* by looking forward in time. There is a blatant over-reliance on the commentaries of Dionysius bar Salibi, who wrote some eight hundred years after Epiphanius. An appeal to the later evidence is perhaps understandable, since it would appear that it holds the keys that would unlock the puzzle of this heretical group.<sup>81</sup> Yet it must be recognized that since the initial publication of portions of Dionysius bar Salibi's commentary on the Apocalypse by John Gwynn, a fundamental methodological shift has occurred in the way the *Alogi* have been analyzed: the earliest sources, generally held to be of utmost value to the historian, have been reinterpreted and re-contextualized in light of much later sources.

Methodologically this approach is perplexing. The task of the historian is to bring together relevant information in a judicious way to determine the most accurate picture of the scrutinized subject, despite the difficulties often imposed by an absence of data that has been lost in the unfolding of history. Inversely, the historian's task is not to promote the most convenient solution,

---

81 As Harris ('Presbyter Gaius,' 47) notes, 'And now for our problem; did Gaius write against the Fourth Gospel, yea or nay? The answer will come from the same quarter as before, for the Syrian Church holds the keys of all the problems.'

particularly when a notably facile conclusion requires that the earliest evidence be altered, misinterpreted, or taken out of context. Nevertheless, it has become common to take the information provided by bar Salibi at face value, assigning it an evidentiary value equal to that of the earliest extant sources.<sup>82</sup>

Although it is true that similarities in the contents of these writings would naturally incline one to place them in the same pool of evidence, few have raised serious questions about the legitimacy of the bar Salibi evidence to effectively determine how one is to understand a history that came some thousand years earlier. The testimony of bar Salibi has become the ink in the water of the evidence pertaining to the *Alogi*: all the early evidence now bears its mark and is interpreted in light of it.

This raises an important question. Has the original context of the *Alogi* become lost in this process? If the bar Salibi evidence is set aside as the mediating factor in the pool of evidence and the focus is placed on the writings of the earlier Church Fathers—sources that are very familiar to Epiphanius throughout his *Panarion*—one finds that these sources hold a set of keys themselves, which unlock a very different explanation of the *Alogi*.

I have yet to find any compelling or adequate reasons to follow J.D. Smith, Jr.'s claims to have intuited the content of lost Hippolytan and Gaian works, which he argues are the ultimate sources of information for bar Salibi, Epiphanius, and '*all later reflections*' on the Johannine controversy, and that they can be seen through the testimony of bar Salibi.<sup>83</sup> By prioritizing the later

82 Harris juxtaposes Epiphanius' testimony with the bar Salibi commentaries and uses the latter as an interpretive device for the former (52–3). The same is also true of T.H. Robinson (494). R.M. Grant includes the bar Salibi material as part of his collection of various second-century fragments. R.M. Grant, *Second-Century Christianity: A Collection of Fragments*, 2nd edition (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003), 86. Grant's introduction to the section entitled 'Gaius on New Testament Books' is telling: 'Eusebius quotes fragments of Gaius of Rome . . . on Christian antiquities but not his criticism of the Gospel and Apocalypse of John, for which we have to rely on the account of the 'Alogi' by Epiphanius and on the twelfth-century commentary by Dionysius Bar Salibi' (83–4). Moreover, the apparatus of Holl's critical edition of the *Panarion* and Williams' recent English translation both align the bar Salibi evidence with Epiphanius' testimony as an explanatory feature. *GCS* 31,2 *Epiphanius II*, 251; Williams (trans.), *Panarion: Books II and III, De Fide*. Second, Revised Ed. (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 26, n. 1. Even in his collection of documents from the early Church, J. Stevenson includes a portion of bar Salibi's commentary as indicative of 'yet another controversy at Rome in the early third century.' J. Stevenson (ed.), *A New Eusebius: Documents illustrating the history of the Church to AD 337*. Revised by W.H.C. Frend (London: SPCK, 1987), 153.

83 Smith, 'Gaius', 425–6; emphasis that of Smith. Cf. 387ff. The *Dialogue with Proclus* is lost except for that which has survived in Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica* (HE 2.25,7,

evidence, Smith arrives at a number of conclusions before his examination of Epiphanius' testimony ever takes place.<sup>84</sup> Inevitably, this methodology has aligned the evidence in such a way that the *Alogi* must be reduced to a single individual, Gaius of Rome. However, this analysis also amounts to a forfeiture in recognizing the elements of Epiphanius' testimony that are clearly drawn from earlier extant sources that do not require the bar Salibi commentaries to act as an intermediary. Neither is it necessary to presume that Epiphanius garnered all his information from a lost work of Hippolytus.

I also do not find the works of Brent and Hill to be entirely sufficient in establishing an entirely coherent counter-narrative. Their criticisms and analyses are helpful in establishing the initial groundwork upon which a revised storyline based primarily on the earliest evidence can be constructed, but more work remains to be done. Building up on the questions of Brent and Hill, the focus of the remainder of this work is deconstruction of the old methodology and the construction and implementation of this new way forward. Thus, in the next chapter the task will be to exonerate Gaius of Rome for a crime he never committed. Careful attention will be paid to disproving the conclusion that Gaius of Rome and bar Salibi's *Caius Haereticus* are one in the same. Having exculpated Gaius, the way forward is open to asking *new* questions about the Johannine Controversy. This involves delving into the complex character and sometimes-fanciful writings of Epiphanius of Salamis. Upon establishing Epiphanius' unique methodology as an historian and heresiologist, it is then possible to ask the question whether or not he fabricated his account of the *Alogi* based on his own amalgamation of various bits from his

---

3.28.2, 3.31.4, cf. 6.20.3). For Smith's analysis of the *Dialogue with Proclus* see 268–311, for Hippolytus' lost *Defense* see 336–418.

84 Ibid., 222–55. Elsewhere, Smith has this to say on the issue of determining Epiphanius' sources for the objections to the Gospel of John: 'Our primary objective in this section is to examine the structure and content of Epiphanius' refutation and defense of the Fourth Gospel in order to determine how valuable it is in reconstructing Hippolytus' refutations in the *Defense* against Gaius and his solutions for harmonizing the contradictions alleged against the Gospel of John.' He goes on to say, 'Determining the arguments contained in Epiphanius' refutations which derive from Hippolytus as his primary source is especially difficult. Epiphanius is essentially dependent on Hippolytus' *Defense* for the content and form of the objections and also for the content of the refutations which answers directly to the objections and for the general form of the refutations.' (381). Smith admits other influences as well (e.g. Ephraem the Syrian in *Haer.* 51.22.7, the *Syriac Didaskalia* in *Haer.* 51.26–27, as well as the criticisms of the Greek Philosophers in *Haer.* 51.8–9), but these are 'unrelated discussions' (382).

predecessors. This is the focus of the final section of this work, which aims to reverse engineer Epiphanius' account in order to determine the sources behind his construction of the *Alogi*. Yet throughout each of the following chapters it will be evident that by giving priority to the earliest evidence, a very different picture of the *Alogi* emerges, one in which the *Alogi* is seen to be much broader in scope than has been realized.

## Exonerating Gaius of Rome

*Was Gaius orthodox or heretical? Or, was Gaius orthodox and heretical?*<sup>1</sup>

Poor Gaius. It is truly unfortunate that he has come to personify the antagonism with which the early church treated the Johannine literature because the evidence to support such a claim simply is not there, despite the fact that ‘definitive’<sup>2</sup> studies of Gaius claim otherwise.<sup>3</sup>

Despite branding him as a heretic, scholars are careful to strike a balance with claims of a successful ‘*rehabilitation of Gaius as an early biblical critic*.’<sup>4</sup> This forces the question, which side is Gaius on? Is he orthodox or heretical? Scholars tend to want it both ways. Thus, we read claims that Gaius is indeed the lone member of the ‘heresy’ known as the *Alogi*, but his views, at least in his own time, were actually representative of the early Roman ecclesiastical sentiments towards the Johannine literature. As such, Gaius was ‘unequivocally on the side of orthodoxy’ in his fight against Montanism and his rejection of the Johannine literature was actually ‘in the service of the church in Rome.’<sup>5</sup>

From a later perspective this blend of orthodoxy and heresy seems incompatible, but in the second and third centuries we are reassured that it was not so anomalous. According to some modern estimations, Irenaeus tried, and failed, to exterminate Gaius’ dangerous views (cf. *AH* 3.11.9), however in the end Irenaeus overstated his case, for his idea of a four-fold Gospel canon was simply that—an ‘idea,’ not a reality.<sup>6</sup> Nor would it become a reality for some

1 Smith, ‘Gaius,’ 2.

2 Culpepper, *John*, 137, n. 86.

3 Smith, ‘Gaius,’ 426–7.

4 Ibid., 430.

5 Ibid., 429. Here Smith follows closely the views of Schwartz (‘Über den Tod,’ 93), who describes Gaius in precisely the same way.

6 E.g. Schwatz, ‘Über den Tod,’ 42: ‘Irenäus literarische Polemik war für die Praxis des römischen Bischofs nicht maßgebend.’ Likewise, G.M. Hahneman (101), in support of his later dating of the *Muratorian Fragment*, argues that Irenaeus’ four-fold Gospel must have been ‘something of an innovation, for if a fourfold gospel had been established and generally acknowledged, then Irenaeus would not have offered such a tortured insistence on its numerical legitimacy’. This view, while prevalent, is not universal. For an opposing view, see Stanton, ‘Fourfold Gospel,’ 319ff., esp. 322: ‘By the time Irenaeus wrote in about 180 AD, the fourfold gospel was very well established. Irenaeus is not defending an innovation, but explaining why, unlike



time.<sup>7</sup> This is true at least for the epicenter of nascent Christianity and Gaius' hometown, Rome, where, 'To around the close of the second century, history is unable to name a single orthodox Roman for whom the Fourth Gospel had been of any significance.'<sup>8</sup>

As the argument goes, for the true status of the Gospel canon in the early church one must look not to Irenaeus, but to the accused. Thus, attention turns to Gaius of Rome, who by modern (and ancient) accounts was a 'conservative' Roman ecclesiastical leader, 'quite competent and astute in his rhetorical and exegetical skills,'<sup>9</sup> who defended local Roman orthodox tradition against 'innovative' foreign theologies that were potentially undermining of the truth of the Gospel.

Yet many scholars have pushed Gaius' role in the early church further. It was because of Gaius' careful study of the differences amongst the four canonical Gospels that later church fathers took seriously his analysis and wrestled with the issue of which works should constitute the Christian canon of scripture. From this view, Gaius is actually an underappreciated leader of the early church; one to whom subsequent Christianity owes a debt of gratitude for his preservation and promulgation of orthodoxy. Gaius comes off as a figure that is praised for his orthodoxy while also condemned for his heterodoxy.

### 3.1 The Gaian Paradox

Gaius' attempt to protect the Roman church from the Montanist heresy by means of rejecting the Johannine literature thus creates a paradox where Gaius is both orthodox and heretical. It is a common refrain that it is not his fault that later church tradition would turn its back on his conservative,

---

the heretics, the church has four gospels, no more, no less.' Also, Hill, *Who Chose the Gospels?*, 34–68, and Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 10: 'He [Irenaeus] certainly did not invent this collection [of the Gospel 'canon'] himself; it had already existed for quite a long time in the mainstream church, largely recognized and used in worship.'

7 For example, Elaine Pagels, *Beyond Belief: The Secret Gospel of Thomas* (New York: Random House, 2004), 111, argues that it was not until the fourth century when Athanasius 'took up and extended Irenaeus's agenda' of the four-fold Gospel. See also Lee M. McDonald, 'The Gospels in Early Christianity: Their Origin, Use, and Authority,' in Stanley E. Porter (ed.), *Reading the Gospels Today* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004), 150–178. McDonald notes (170), 'Irenaeus's acceptance of the four canonical Gospels alone was not generally shared by his contemporaries or even by many Christians at a later time.'

8 Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy*, 208.

9 Smith, 'Gaius', 430–31.

protectionist views that legitimately saw the Johannine literature (and especially those heretical views that used the Gospel of John to support their errant theologies such as the Montanists and the Gnostics) as a threat to the integrity of the church. Gaius was a man of the times, and his opposition to the Johannine writings for the sake of orthodoxy was nothing if not the status quo. Earlier estimations of Gaius as being within the bounds of orthodoxy in his rejection of the Johannine literature continue today. As one scholar notes, 'Gaius's standing as a leader of the church at Rome shows that the authority of John and its apostolic authorship were not so firmly established (at least in Rome . . . ) that it could not be challenged by one of the scholars of the church.'<sup>10</sup>

The story of Gaius as the conservative Roman church official who remained true to his orthodox sensibilities and thus rejected the questionable Johannine literature is a very compelling theory, and the more it is repeated the stronger its authority appears to be. And while it is certainly one way of calibrating a meagre pool of evidence, this conclusion, while convenient, is misguided. The remainder of this chapter will therefore take a closer look at the evidence concerning this 'orthodox heretic' Gaius.

For a ranking ecclesiastical figure in Rome whose influence was supposedly widespread, the paucity of evidence concerning this man is astonishing. When his name does appear, many ecclesiastical writers that would have found Gaius' supposed denunciation of the Gospel of John (and to a lesser extent John's Apocalypse) to be reprehensible speak of him very fondly, thus raising the question of whether bar Salibi's *Caius haereticus* is to be identified with the historical Gaius of Rome.<sup>11</sup> Furthermore, a surprisingly small amount of attention has been paid to the dates of Gaius' activity. His negative views of John's Gospel have been read into nearly every instance in which the integrity of this work has been questioned, from Irenaeus' anonymous opponents of the Johannine Paraclete, to the assumed defence of the Gospel of John in the *Muratorian Fragment*, and of course the work attributed to Hippolytus that (purportedly) defended the Gospel and Apocalypse of John against the views of Gaius. However, a more precise dating of Gaius precludes him from being read into any and every situation in which the Gospel of John appears volatile. By establishing the dates of Gaius, it will be possible to determine the limits of his influence.

<sup>10</sup> Culpepper, *John*, 121.

<sup>11</sup> For a catalogue of the evidence concerning Gaius prior to Gwynn's discovery of the bar Salibi commentaries, see Martinus Josephus Routh, *Reliquiae Sacrae*, Vol. II (Oxonii: Typis Academicis, 1814), 2–32. All of his notices are considered here as well.

Once a clearer picture of the evidence concerning Gaius' historical background has been established, it will be possible to consider more carefully Gaius' views on the Johannine literature. This analysis not only calls into question whether Gaius was at the center of the so-called 'Johannine Controversy', it also provides a foundation upon which the evidence from Dionysius bar Salibi and Ebed-Jesu may be scrutinized even more carefully.

### 3.2 The Historical and Literary Legacy of Gaius

Because so little is known of Gaius of Rome, his reputation is malleable, but not necessarily indiscernible. From all extant accounts up to the time of bar Salibi in the twelfth century, Gaius was the furthest thing from a heretic.

The first notice recorded of Gaius is that of Eusebius, who, upon reading his anti-Montanist polemical work against Proclus, labels him as an 'ecclesiastical man' (ἐκκλησιαστικὸς ἀνὴρ, *HE* 2.25.6) and a 'very learned man' (λογιωτάτου ἀνδρός, *HE* 6.20.3).<sup>12</sup> Despite the numerous scholarly annotations to the contrary, Eusebius does not speak of Gaius holding any official position within the Church.<sup>13</sup> Twice over Eusebius states that Gaius operated during the pontificate of Zephyrinus (199–217 AD; *HE* 2.25.6; 6.20.3), and he notes that Gaius does not accept Pauline authorship of the book of Hebrews (*HE* 6.20.3). Eusebius is also the *only* witness who claims to have read Gaius' work, the *Dialogue with Proclus*, and he provides quotes from this work intermittently. It is odd, though, that Eusebius never cites the *Dialogue* as a source in book five of the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, in which he launches his offensive against the New Prophecy. In fact, there would be little reason to suspect that the *Dialogue* was an anti-Montanist work if Eusebius did not expressly tell us that this was the case. Nevertheless, Eusebius provided us with a great service on the one hand, for if it were it not for him, it is likely that this work would have never been known to exist. On the other hand, however, the fact remains that due to his meager reporting, there is very little about the *Dialogue with Proclus* that can be known with any surety.<sup>14</sup>

12 A certain 'Gaius' is also mentioned in the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* (22.2), but there is little reason to connect him with Gaius of Rome; although Bludau (40) disagrees.

13 The listing of a certain 'Gaius' as bishop of Rome in Eusebius' *Chronicon* does not comport with the dating of Gaius of Rome, for the Gaius of the *Chronicon* is dated ca. 282 CE. Also Eusebius is clear that Gaius was active while Zephyrinus was bishop, thus excluding a Gaian pontificate.

14 Manor, 'Proclus,' 141.

Around the turn of the fifth century Jerome would include Gaius in his list of *Illustrious Men*. It is safe to assume that the bulk of his information was taken directly from Eusebius,<sup>15</sup> notably Gaius' role as a Roman anti-Montanist, his rejection of Pauline attribution of Hebrews and his activity during the pontificate of Zephyrinus (*De vir. ill.* 59). A bit later Theodoret admits to knowing nothing more of this Gaius beyond his authorship of a *Dialogue with Proclus* (*Haer. fab. comp.* 2.3, 3.2). Again, Eusebius was undoubtedly the source.

In the ninth century, Photius embellishes Gaius' reputation to one of even greater orthodox prestige. He claims to have found information on Gaius from a 'marginal note' (ἐν παραγραφαῖς) in one of his sources that claimed Gaius was a presbyter in Rome and ordained 'bishop of the nations' (ἐθνῶν ἐπίσκοπον; *Bibl.* 48). This information would not have come from the few, brief notices in Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica*. Photius records that 'some' think the *Dialogue with Proclus* should be attributed to Josephus or Justin Martyr. But Photius places his trust in his unknown marginal source and reclaims this work as from the hand of Gaius, along with two other works, *On the Universe*, the *Labyrinth*, and *Against the Heresy of Artemon*.

It was not until the twelfth century Gaius' legacy would change drastically with the comments from Dionysius bar Salibi († 1171 AD). Of course, here the 'heretic Gaius' lodged a number of objections against the Johannine literature in a dispute with Hippolytus of Rome. Around a century later (ca. 1300), Ebed-Jesu would record a list of Hippolytan works that includes the title *Heads against Gaius*.

In the middle of the eighteenth century, Ludovico Antonio Muratori, the discoverer of the oldest list of New Testament books (including the Gospel and Apocalypse of John) that now bears his name, believed the author to be none other than Gaius the Presbyter (viz. Gaius of Rome).<sup>16</sup> Again, Muratori's Gaian attribution is probably based largely on what he knew of Gaius from the record of Eusebius.<sup>17</sup>

Thus, aside from the late Syrian evidence, Gaius' reputation had clearly blossomed posthumously, making him one of the great luminaries of the early church. However, by the end of the nineteenth century, Gaius would become stripped of much of his literary legacy. A number of works once attributed

15 In the introduction to this work, Jerome states that Eusebius has been 'of utmost importance' for his information.

16 Ludovico Antonio Muratori, *Antiquitates italicæ mediæ ævi*, Tom. III (Mediolani: ex typographia Societatis palatinae, 1738–1742) 809–880 at 851. The manuscript itself is number I 101 sup. Cf. Hahneman, 30.

17 Robinson, 'Authorship,' 481.

to Gaius were properly reallocated to Hippolytus. Lightfoot, Robinson and others eliminated Gaius as the author of the *Muratorian Fragment*, arguing that it actually came from the hand of Hippolytus.<sup>18</sup> Moreover, as a result of Lightfoot's analysis, into Hippolytus' hands went nearly all the other works that Photius had attributed to Gaius, save the *Dialogue with Proclus*.<sup>19</sup>

### 3.3 Gaius of Rome vs. bar Salibi's *Caius Haereticus*

The question that should be asked, yet almost never is, centers around whether it is valid to identify bar Salibi's *Caius haereticus* with Gaius of Rome. It would seem that only Lightfoot expressed any reservations about linking the two: 'Gaius therefore is alive once more, though he seemed to me to be dead. But, whether this is really Gaius the Roman presbyter or another, may perhaps be still an open question.'<sup>20</sup> To my knowledge, no one has carefully considered this important question. Despite the fact that it is generally taken for granted that bar Salibi is referring to the very same Gaius of Rome mentioned by Eusebius, Jerome and others, the association of bar Salibi's *Caius* with Gaius of Rome (and Epiphanius' *Alagi*) is, in fact, far from certain.

Yet the only biographical data about Gaius in the writings of bar Salibi comes from the introduction to his *Commentary on the Apocalypse* where he states, 'Hippolytus of Rome said: "A man appeared, named Gaius, who claimed that the Gospel was not by John, nor the Apocalypse, but by the heretic Cerinthus."' <sup>21</sup> Following this, bar Salibi refers to him as 'this Gaius' (*hunc Caium*),<sup>22</sup> 'Gaius the heretic' (*Caius haereticus*)<sup>23</sup> or simply 'Gaius' (*Caius*).<sup>24</sup> The evidence from

18 Ibid.; Lightfoot, *AF*, i, 2, 405–413; M.-J. Lagrange, 'L'auteur du canon de Muratori,' *Rbib* 35 (1926), 83–88. Cf. Brent, *Hippolytus*, 133.

19 Lightfoot, *AF*, i, 2, 377–381; cf. Routh, 143. Though in 1947 Pierre Nautin argued that all the works attributed to Hippolytus on the Statue in Rome that now bears his image and those mentioned by Photius actually belong to the 'Josephus' indicated in Photius' marginal note. See Pierre Nautin, *Hippolyte et Josipe: Contribution a l'histoire de la Littérature Chrétienne du troisième siècle* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1947); *Hippolyte, Contre les heresies: fragment, etude, et edition critique* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1949). Nautin's theory has not received widespread acceptance.

20 Lightfoot, *AF*, i, 2, 388.

21 *Hippolytus Romanus dixit: Apparuit vir, nomine Caius, qui asserebat Evangelium non esse Iohannis, nec Apocalypsim, sed Cerinthis haeretici ea esse. Comm. Apoc.*, 1.

22 *Comm. Apoc. praescr.*, 2.

23 Idem, 8–9 (in his comments on Rev. 8:8, 12; 20:2).

24 Idem, 10 (in his comments on Rev. 9:2, 15).

the manuscripts now housed in the British Library that Harris brought forward (and minimized) takes us even further away from establishing the identity of this 'Gaius', for it is clear that bar Salibi originally failed to include his name in his *Commentary on John*. Nowhere does bar Salibi indicate that this 'Gaius' is the same as the author of the *Dialogue with Proclus*, or that the 'Gaius' of his commentary held any anti-Montanist sentiments. Nor does bar Salibi refer to Gaius as *Caius Romanus* as in the case of *Hippolytus Romanus*, and he does not state that 'Gaius' rejected Hebrews as genuinely Pauline, as Eusebius and others noted.

The 'Gaius' of bar Salibi has become identified as the author of the *Dialogue with Proclus* due to various inferential leaps that span some distance. Behind this is feeble historical and textual rationale. *Historically*, bar Salibi places Gaius as an interlocutor with Hippolytus of Rome, thus situating him around the same time that Gaius of Rome lived. It is argued that when taken together, the evidence from bar Salibi and Ebed-Jesu in conjunction with the title on the statue of Hippolytus in Rome (which, it should be remembered, does *not* bear Gaius' name) all suggest that Hippolytus wrote against a certain Gaius' anti-Johannine views. Since both were contemporaries and presumably located in the same city, it is assumed this must be Gaius of Rome.

*Textually*, bar Salibi's 'Gaius' is assumed to be the same as 'Gaius of Rome' due to a dubious reading of Eusebius' notice in *HE* 3.28.1–2, where Gaius attacks Cerinthus' *Apocalypse*. This is due to the fact that many have mistakenly interpreted Eusebius' record to mean that Gaius of Rome attributed John's Apocalypse to Cerinthus, thus linking Eusebius' Gaius with bar Salibi's *Caius haereticus*.<sup>25</sup>

Yet there are important differences that often go unnoticed. For example, there is nothing in bar Salibi's record of the criticisms of 'Gaius' to insinuate that these had anything to do with Montanist eschatological views, let alone any opposition to the Johannine Paraclete, thus raising important questions as to whether bar Salibi's source was (as Smith argues) Gaius' *Dialogue with Proclus* and/or Hippolytus' *Apology*, which is assumed to have been Hippolytus' response to Gaius' *Dialogue*.<sup>26</sup> Nor do the criticisms relate in any way to the carnal millennium desired by Cerinthus, to which Gaius took such strong exception (cf. *HE* 3.28.1–2).

What about the fact that Gaius of Rome did not consider the book of Hebrews to be Pauline, as noted by Eusebius (*HE* 6.20.3)? Bar Salibi men-

25 See below (3.4).

26 Smith, 'Gaius', 425–6.

tions this, but he mistakenly attributes this view to *Hippolytus*, not Gaius.<sup>27</sup> Furthermore, the criticisms of *Caius haereticus* themselves do not reflect the stylings of Eusebius' 'learned' man, Harris' 'higher critic' or Smith's 'reputable scholar'. They are, instead, trite and simplistic. Simply put, *prima facie*, bar Salibi's designation of *Gaius haereticus* does not cohere with Eusebius' Gaius as ἐκκλησιαστικὸς ἀνὴρ. We are therefore left either with a Gaian paradox or incompatibility between these two 'Gaius' figures.

### 3.3.1 *Gaius of Rome, the Presbyter/Bishop?*

The 'Gaian paradox' is even more compelling when one considers his supposedly high ecclesiastical rank from which he disseminated his anti-Johannine rhetoric. Yet the reference to the Eusebian Gaius holding an ecclesiastical office is only mentioned once by the anonymous author of the marginal note in Photius' records, where Gaius is said to have been 'bishop to the nations'.

Where did this information concerning Gaius' ecclesiastical rank originate? There are at least two explanations. First, if Hill and Brent are right, this is easily accounted for given the erroneous assumption by the author of Photius' marginal note that Gaius of Rome was the author of *The Labyrinth* (the tenth book of Hippolytus' *Elenchos*). In this work the author describes himself as an 'adviser' (σύμβουλος) to a long list of various ethnic groups (Greeks, barbarians, Chaldeans, Assyrians, Egyptians, Lybians, Indians, Ethiopians, Celts and Latin generals, and all those living in Europe, Asia and Libya; *Ref.* 10.34.1).<sup>28</sup> It is not difficult to see how the author of Photius' marginal comments could have garbled this information to reflect the author's role as ἐθῶν ἐπίσκοπον. Furthermore, Photius' source may also have formed the dates he attributes to Gaius. We know from Eusebius that the work *Against Artemon*, which Photius' source attributed to Gaius, directly and repeatedly refers to the times of Victor and Zephyrinus (ap. *HE* 5.28.3–6, 8).<sup>29</sup> Secondly, if Lightfoot's early hypothesis were to be considered, as I believe it ought, then the confusion of Gaius and Hippolytus is to blame. In his *Refutation*, Hippolytus speaks of himself as holding an Episcopal office (*Ref. praef.*) and gives special addresses to the Gentiles as though they were his special charge (*Ref.* 10.31, 32, 34).<sup>30</sup>

27 *Comm. Apoc.*, 3–4. Cf. Photius (*Bibl.* 121) where he states that Hippolytus rejected Hebrews as a Pauline work.

28 See Hill, *Johannine Corpus*, 197–8; Brent, *Hippolytus*, 132. For the Greek text, see Marcovich, 415.

29 Hill, *Johannine Corpus*, 198, n. 84; Brent, *Hippolytus*, 132.

30 Lightfoot, 'Caius or Hippolytus,' 104.



Both explanations of this information are entirely possible, but not altogether necessary. After the analysis of Lightfoot, it is clear that whoever provided Photius' information was misinformed as to the true identity of Gaius, and thus the designation of him as 'bishop' or 'presbyter' is irrelevant. This claim to office rests on the presumption that Gaius of Rome was the author of works that he never wrote. Perhaps Gaius did hold an office within the Church, but given that there is no reliable source to indicate this is the case, there is no reason to continue to make this claim.<sup>31</sup> Photius' account is too confused and demonstrably unreliable to warrant uncritical acceptance, and those sources that are chronologically nearest to Gaius and familiar with his work make no mention of him holding any office whatsoever.

Since there is no concrete evidence to prove that Gaius of Rome occupied an official church office, the Gaian paradox has become slightly less forceful. The question remains as to whether the paradox is true at all. The evidence examined thus far leads away from a positive identification. However, if Smith is right, and Gaius of Rome personifies the Johannine controversy, then he is to be seen lurking behind Irenaeus' notice of an anonymous group opposed to the Johannine Paraclete, works of Hippolytus that have been lost in time, Origen's notice regarding issues of Gospel incompatibility, the implied defense of John's writings in the *Muratorian Fragment*, and Dionysius of Alexandria's anonymous predecessors that rejected the Apocalypse of John as a work by Cerinthus—a very busy man indeed for the apparent lack of anyone noticing his anti-Johannine exploits, and whose dates could span from the mid second century well into the third. Thus, in order to determine whether any of these associations are plausible it is critically important to establish the dates of Gaius' activity.

### 3.4 The Dates of Gaius

There is almost universal harmony amongst all the sources regarding the dates of Gaius' battle against the Montanists. Eusebius mentions twice that Gaius was active in Rome during the episcopate of Zephyrinus (199–217). Jerome and Theodoret agree. The unreliable marginal note in Photius' manuscript mentions that Gaius' activity included the earlier time of Victorinus (189–199) in addition to Zephyrinus. Although the dating of Gaius appears secure, the

31 Contra Tabbernee, who, on the basis of Photius' testimony, states, 'There is no reason to doubt that Gaius was a presbyter.' William Tabbernee, *Fake Prophecy and Polluted Sacraments: Ecclesiastical and Imperial Reactions to Montanism* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 69.



available sources that speak directly to his dates (with the exception of Photius) are ultimately reliant upon Eusebius' placement of the historical Gaius. Thus, some have argued that Eusebius was wrong and Gaius of Rome mounted his attack against the Gospel and Apocalypse of John much earlier than the beginning of the third century. The most notable arguments come from Schwartz and Smith.

### 3.4.1 *Dating of Gaius by Schwartz and Smith*

Schwartz called into question Eusebius' dating of Gaius in part because he maintained that Irenaeus' anonymous *Alii*, who rejected the Johannine Paraclete, must have been Gaius of Rome.<sup>32</sup> He substantiated his position by appealing to Eusebius' notice that in his refutation of Proclus Gaius appeals to the Asiatic 'trophies' of Peter and Paul, but not John. Schwartz argued that this indicated Gaius lived prior to the tradition of the Ephesian John as told by Polycrates in a letter to Victor, preserved in part by Eusebius (*HE* 3.31.3–4).<sup>33</sup> Thus, around the time of AD 160 it was still possible to doubt the authenticity of John's Gospel without being excommunicated or branded a heretic, and thus Gaius' *Dialogue* must have been written during this time.<sup>34</sup> Eusebius wrongly believed Gaius to be contemporaneous with Hippolytus because of a *fictitious* dialogue between the two, fragments of which were in Eusebius' hands and are identical to the proof text of bar Salibi. This fiction was the product of Hippolytus' own written refutation of Gaius' *Dialogue with Proclus*, written decades earlier.<sup>35</sup>

Schwartz's theory provides an explanation for why Gaius could reasonably be an 'ecclesiastical man' and maintain his anti-Johannine convictions, but it requires a severe recalibration of the extant evidence.<sup>36</sup> For one thing, Eusebius, who may have had his own misgivings about the Johannine Apocalypse, did not share any ambivalence towards John's Gospel. If Gaius had rejected only the Apocalypse, then Eusebius may have been comfortable with issuing his praise of Gaius; but if he also rejected the Gospel as a heretical forgery, it is beyond question that Eusebius would not have stamped Gaius so

32 Schwartz, 'Über den Tod,' 41–2. Later, Grant ('Fourth Gospel and the Church,' 108, n.77) concurred, noting that Gaius' objections are 'pre-Irenaeus'.

33 Schwartz, 'Über den Tod,' 41–2.

34 *Ibid.*, 42.

35 See also P. Ladeuze, 56–8, who argues that Gaius' *Dialogue* must have antedated Irenaeus' notice, and the reason Irenaeus uses the ambiguous terms *Alii* is that Gaius' position would not have constituted an heretical opinion in his own time.

36 See Gustave Bardy, 'Cerinthe,' *Rbib* 30 (1921): 358–9, n.1.

positively. This fact prevented later scholars such as Carl Schmidt<sup>37</sup> from following Schwartz's original hypothesis, and with good reason. In abandoning Eusebius' dating of Gaius, Schwartz was left to create a history for Gaius out of thin air, with little to go on except Irenaeus' brief notice. Schwartz would later come around and affirm Gaius' dates as stated by Eusebius.<sup>38</sup> Nevertheless, some modern scholars still presume an earlier date for Gaius of Rome.<sup>39</sup>

Smith has his own unique solution to this dilemma. He argues that Irenaeus was indeed responding to Gaius in *AH* 3.11.9, not because he had read Gaius' objections in the *Dialogue* but due to the 'oral stage' of these criticisms. 'It was not until fifteen or twenty years later that Gaius shaped these discussions and arguments in the form of a literary dialogue,' and thus, 'Irenaeus' comments reflected the early historical tradition of the Johannine controversy, *not* its literary tradition.'<sup>40</sup> Though he accepts Eusebius' date of Gaius' *Dialogue*, as with Schwartz, Smith is left reconstructing a hypothetical history for Gaius to facilitate his conclusions.

The dating of Gaius is founded on either taking Eusebius' dating at face value or rejecting it and hypothesizing Gaius' dates earlier into the mid-second century. However, there is one other concrete piece of information that deserves attention: the fact that Gaius battled with the Montanist leader, Proclus. If the dates of Proclus can be established, the dates of Gaius should become clearer.

### 3.4.2 *The Dates of Proclus*

Amidst all the confusion, this much is certain: Gaius wrote a treatise against the Montanist Proclus. Eusebius read it, liked what he found therein, and dated it at the beginning of the third century. Despite the theories that date Gaius much earlier than Eusebius suggests, there is no evidence that Proclus was a pre-Irenaeus figure.

In addition to Eusebius' notices that establish Proclus and Gaius in the time of Zephyrinus, Ps.-Tertullian (*Adv. omn. haer.* 7.2) also states that Proclus headed up a division of adherents to the New Prophecy known as the Cataproclans, which Ps.-Tertullian contrasts with those who followed Aeschines (Cataeschinetans). He distinguishes the Aeschinian version of New Prophecy as decidedly modalist monarchian, for 'they affirm Christ to be Son and Father.' Is it possible to surmise from this that Proclus had encoun-

37 Cf. Schmidt, 436ff.

38 Schwartz, 'Johannes und Kerinthos,' 212–13.

39 E.g. Culpepper (*John*, 121) takes for granted the view that Irenaeus was responding to Gaius in *AH* 3.11.9.

40 Smith, 'Gaius', 279–80.

tered the monarchian controversy—with which Hippolytus is a well-known participant—and that his school of the New Prophecy had taken the more orthodox Christological fork in the road?

Tertullian, himself of Montanist convictions, places Proclus last in a list of venerated anti-Valentinian writers (following Justin Martyr, Miltiades and Irenaeus; *Adv. Val.* 5). He describes Proclus as '*Proculus noster*', which could simply imply Tertullian's fraternal identification within the New Prophecy,<sup>41</sup> or one could interpret it as a designation that Proclus was a contemporary of Tertullian.<sup>42</sup> In support of the latter, Tertullian is privy to personal details of Proculus (his eloquence and chastity in old age), thus suggesting that the two were personal acquaintances. If Proclus were a contemporary of Tertullian, and if the monarchianism against which Proclus reacted were of Sabellian<sup>43</sup> variety (flourishing in the early third century), then Eusebius' dates of Proclus, and thus Gaius, may be correct after all.<sup>44</sup>

There is, in fact, no evidence that Proclus was active in the New Prophecy movement prior to Irenaeus. In light of this, Smith's dating of Gaius may finally be put to rest alongside the early view of Schwartz. Because Proclus is a third-century figure, Gaius' accusations against this Montanist leader belong

41 E.g. T.D. Barnes, *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 44.

42 There is little reason to doubt Proclus and 'Proculus' are to be identified as one in the same (cf. *De. vir. ill.* 59). See Campenhausen, *Formation*, 233, n. 126.

43 Tertullian was also a critic of Sabellianism (*Adv. Prax.*). Hippolytus (*Ref.* 8.19) is aware of this division within Montanism, for he notes that some of the Montanists held similar beliefs to the Noetians, viz. that the Father and the Son are one in suffering and in death. Epiphanius describes Sabellius' beliefs as similar to that attributed to Aeschines (*Haer.* 62.1.4); so also does Didymus of Alexandria (*De Trin.* 3.41). According to Didymus, this teaching originated from an oracle of Montanus in which he states, 'I am the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost.' For his part, Jerome makes the explicit connection between Montanism and Sabellianism (*Ep.* 41.3). H.J. Lawlor *Evsebian: Essays on the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius Bishop of Caesarea* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912). Lawlor (III) held that the Montanists 'taught what later became known as Sabellianism.' In addition to Didymus, Lawlor also notes the record of Asterius Urbanus (*ap. HE* 5.16.17) who cites Maximilla as saying 'I am Word and Spirit and Power,' which, according to Lawlor (*ibid.*), 'for the words ῥῆμα, πνεῦμα, and δύναμις must be taken as equivalent to Montanus's Son, Spirit and Father.' Lawlor is correct in noting that Tertullian was very much against the Monarchianistic tendencies of Praxeas, which further bolsters the present argument that the issue of Sabellianism caused a split in the Montanist camp and the views of Tertullian and Proclus stood in sharp contrast to that of the Cataeschinetsans.

44 In his final article on the subject, E. Schwartz maintained this view. See 'Johannes und Kerinthos,' 212–14.

around the same time. Thus, Eusebius' dating of Gaius complies with the other available evidence. Nevertheless, the tendency to see Gaius as the identity of Irenaeus' *Alii* is also based on the view that Gaius of Rome actually rejected the Gospel of John. Thus the question persists: is Gaius of Rome the same as bar Salibi's *Caius haereticus*? Is there validity to the Gaian paradox? If so, Gaius of Rome must have campaigned against the Johannine writings in his efforts to abolish Montanism.

### 3.5 Gaius and the Fourth Gospel

The status of the four-fold Gospel canon at the beginning of the third century is a crucial issue that remains the subject of much debate. Was the Gospel of John on the outer fringes of early ecclesiastical acceptance by this time, or did Irenaeus' four-Gospel canon represent a common view? Did Gaius have any role in pushing the gospel canon away from John's Gospel?<sup>45</sup> However, the evidence to support this conclusion is built on a tenuous sequence of questionable inferences. When the evidence is carefully scrutinized, the conclusion that emerges from historical and textual analysis suggests that Gaius has wrongly been accused of a crime that he did not commit.

If Gaius did reject the Gospel of John, there should be a literary trail that leads back to Gaius himself as well as corroborating historical evidence from this period of time. Textual and historical considerations will aid in discerning Gaius' view of the Fourth Gospel.

#### 3.5.1 *The Textual Evidence*

First, since Gaius is known to have written only one work against the Montanist leader Proclus, Gaius' antagonism towards John must be found therein.<sup>46</sup> The testimony of Eusebius is therefore of unmatched value. As noted above, Eusebius mentions that Gaius only accepts thirteen Pauline epistles and rejects Hebrews (*HE* 6.20.3). Yet, he mentions nothing about Gaius' (supposed) negative views on John's Gospel. Eusebius is quick to note that Gaius' rejection of Hebrews from the Pauline corpus is still acceptable to some in Rome even

45 'If Gaius, a champion of orthodoxy, could reject the Johannine literature, can we be certain that the fourfold canon was irrevocably established at Rome?' Smith, 'Gaius', 6–7.

46 Culpepper (*John*, 121) argues that after Irenaeus had refuted his anti-Johannine position, 'Some time later (ca. 202–203) Gaius wrote down his arguments against Montanism in the form of a *Dialogue with Proclus*. In this treatise Gaius explained his rejection of the Gospel and Revelation on literary-historical grounds ...'

in his own day. This should not be understood as a defense of Gaius *per se*, for Eusebius makes the same point earlier in his initial discussion of canonical and acknowledged texts (ἐδιαθήκων καὶ ὁμολογουμένων) and disputed (ἀντιλεγομένων) texts (HE 3.3.5). Similarly, according to Photius who claims to have read the lost *Syntagma*, Hippolytus himself said that Paul was not the author of Hebrews (*Bibl.* 121).

The fact that Eusebius includes Gaius' negative views towards Hebrews is notable. Why does he mention this point, which would otherwise be one of little consequence? In fact, he records this view of Gaius because the delineation of which works he accepted is a primary theme of his *Dialogue with Proclus*. According to Eusebius, Gaius devotes his *Dialogue* to 'curbing the indiscretion and boldness of the opposition who collect new scriptures' (HE 6.20.3).<sup>47</sup>

The criticism against Montanism's unique literature is nothing new. The Anonymous, for example, shows reluctance to engage in a debate with the Montanists, lest it seem that he were adding to the doctrines of the New Testament and the Gospels (HE 5.16.3). The Anonymous' citation of a Montanist oracle also suggests they had already been written down (HE 5.16.17).<sup>48</sup> Apollonius mentions a certain 'catholic epistle' (καθολικὴν ἐπιστολήν) written by the Montanist Themiso in which he imitated that of 'the apostle' (HE 5.18.5). Hippolytus also criticizes the Montanists for 'having infinite books' (ὧν βίβλους ἀπείρους ἔχοντες) from which they claim to have learned something more than what is found in the 'Law, Prophets and Gospels' (*Ref.* 19.1–2). If Hippolytus' testimony may be used as a comparison, then it is clear that the 'new Scriptures' are set in contrast to those that were already accepted by the church—the Law, Prophets and the Gospels. Ps.-Tertullian states that Proclus believed that the Paraclete was not in the apostles, but chose to speak through Montanus 'more things' than Christ had said in the Gospel; indeed, not only more things, but also better and greater things (*Adv. omn. haer.* 7).

Gaius of Rome set out in his anti-Montanist work to distinguish 'new scriptures' from those of the church, but as these examples indicate, this was not a new strategy. The question is whether John's Gospel is included in this

47 GCS 6,2, 566.

48 See Campenhausen, *Formation*, 227, esp. n. 98, who also cites Tertullian (*Fuga* 9.4) and Epiphanius (*Haer.* 48) as further examples of Montanist writings. Douglas Powell, 'Tertullianists and Cataphrygians,' VC 29 (1975): 33–54, argues that 'Montanism was a literary movement' (50), citing *Fuga* 9 and *De resurr. carnis* 10 as examples of Tertullian's citation of Montanist 'scripture'.

category,<sup>49</sup> or are these 'new scriptures' better understood as collections of Montanist oracles?<sup>50</sup>

It would be strange for a 'learned' and 'ecclesiastical' man to be wholly unaware of the tradition associated with John's Gospel that dates back as far as Papias. In addition to what I shall argue is Eusebius' record of Papias' statements about John (*HE* 3.24.5–13), Polycrates (*HE* 5.24.2–7), Irenaeus (*AH* 3.1.1) and others (e.g. the 'elders' in *AH* 2.22.5; cf. Polycarp at 3.3.4) speak of the Ephesian tradition that maintains John, who reclined on Jesus' breast (Jn. 21:20), wrote this Gospel during his tenure in Asia.<sup>51</sup> This tradition was also well known to Gaius' contemporaries scattered throughout the Mediterranean basin.<sup>52</sup>

To claim that the Gospel of John was a recent production, a 'new scripture', would be a bizarre claim for Gaius to make. To state that it was a product of the heretic Cerinthus would be to demonstrate the most severe ignorance of a well-known tradition. Cerinthus' dates preclude any work attributed to him as 'recent', and his teachings were entirely contrary to that found in John's Gospel, most notably the pre-existent Logos and John's Logos Christology.<sup>53</sup> Also, the tradition about John's opposition to Cerinthus makes any such claim severely problematic. The most obvious comes from Irenaeus (and later Epiphanius), who makes it plain that John wrote his Gospel to 'remove the error of Cerinthus' (*AH* 3.11.1; cf. *Haer.* 51.4.1). Moreover, Polycarp's account of John fleeing the baths because Cerinthus was there was well known (cf. *AH* 3.3.4). Eusebius relays this story a few sentences after noting Gaius' accusation of Cerinthus' claim to authorship of 'revelations' that he 'pretends were written by a great apostle' (*HE* 3.28.6, 4.14.6; Gaius at 3.28.2). This is significant, for at the very moment Eusebius is writing this section against Cerinthus he has two books in front of him: Gaius' *Dialogue* and Irenaeus' *Against Heresies*.<sup>54</sup> He

49 So argues R.M. Grant, 'Fourth Gospel,' 108.

50 Cf. Campenhausen, *Formation*, 227, n. 98: 'Certainly, when we hear of the innumerable books of the Montanists, about which Hippolytus complains . . . we should think primarily of such collections of oracles.'

51 There is no reason to believe the radical statement of J.J. Gunther, 'The Alexandrian Gospel and the Letters of John,' *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 31 (1980): 407–427: 'The creation of a Johannine Asian myth started with Montanism.' idem, 'Early Identifications,' 410.

52 E.g. Clement of Alexandria 'gives the tradition of the earliest presbyters as to the order of the Gospels' (*ap. HE* 6.14.5–7). So also Origen (*HE* 6.25.9–10; *Hom. Luc.* 1; *Comm. Jo.* 1.6), Hippolytus of Rome (*Comm. Dan.* 1.17) and Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* 4.2, 5).

53 Even Smith agrees that Gaius did not attribute John's Gospel to Cerinthus (though he maintains Gaius still rejected it). See Smith, 'Gaius,' 334.

54 As well as Dionysius of Alexandria's *On the Promises* (*HE* 3.28.3–5).

cites both verbatim and finds their contents worthy of inclusion in his condemnation of Cerinthus.

Now, either Gaius made that audacious claim that John's Gospel ought to be rejected as new scripture written by Cerinthus and Eusebius fails to mention this or no such designation was made at all. Labriolle's suggestion that Eusebius possessed an incomplete copy of Gaius' *Dialogue* that was void of Gaius' criticisms and attribution to Cerinthus is too hypothetical to be convincing.<sup>55</sup> The same is true for Grant's view that Eusebius simply did not recite Gaius' criticisms of John.<sup>56</sup> It is clear to Eusebius after reading Gaius' *Dialogue* which books are on Gaius' bookshelf, and there is no reason to believe that the Gospel of John was absent. If Gaius had attacked the Fourth Gospel because of its ties to Montanism or its association with Cerinthus, it is safe to presume that Eusebius would have not only noticed this in Gaius' attack on Proclus but counteracted this view.

Furthermore, as Harnack<sup>57</sup> realized long ago and as Schwartz came to realize, if Gaius did reject John's Gospel Eusebius would never have referred to Gaius as a 'learned' and 'ecclesiastical' man. Whatever ambivalence Eusebius may have felt towards John's Apocalypse, there was no doubt in his mind that John's Gospel was included in the canon. It is seen clearly in his introduction to the account of the origins of the Gospel of John. Eusebius praises the Gospel of John as 'undisputed', which, along with Matthew's Gospel, was written by a disciple of the Lord (*HE* 3.24.2–5). At the end of his account he repeats the notice that not only John's Gospel but also his first Epistle were accepted without any argument, both now and long ago (*HE* 3.24.17). Indeed, the 'holy quaternity of the Gospels' tops his list of 'accepted books' (*HE* 3.25.1). In short, Eusebius' high estimation of John's Gospel on the one hand and Gaius of Rome on the other are totally incompatible if Gaius did, in fact, reject the Gospel of John.

To presume that Eusebius gave a pass to Gaius' supposedly negative views of John's Gospel is absurd. For example, as I shall argue later, Eusebius did not permit Origen's criticisms of John's Gospel to escape his own rebuttal (cf. *HE*

55 Labriolle, *Crise*, 283–4, n. 6.

56 Grant, 'Fourth Gospel,' 109, n. 85. Elsewhere Grant (*Eusebius as Church Historian* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980], 132), based on the bar Salibi evidence, he argues that Eusebius does recite Gaius' criticisms of John in *HE* 3.24, but he does not mention Gaius' name because, 'It seems that he is already working toward a discussion of the Apocalypse, which Gaius also rejected. He [Eusebius] is planning to appeal to the authority of Gaius on the Apocalypse while rejecting his view on the Gospel. For this reason he certainly prefers to leave out Gaius' name at this point.'

57 Adolf von Harnack, *Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*. 2 vols (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1897–1904), Vol. 1, 27.



3.24.5–13), and Origen *accepted* the Gospel of John!<sup>58</sup> The argument posed by Smith and others that Eusebius did not know the origins of this criticism of Johannine-Synoptic incompatibility is faulty, for Eusebius has read both Origen's *Commentary on John* and Gaius' *Dialogue with Proclus*. In fact, he cites from Gaius' *Dialogue* shortly after his defense of Johannine-Synoptic compatibility (cf. *HE* 3.28.1–2; 3.31.4), without any indication that he was responding to Gaius. I shall argue below in the third section of this work that Origen is the true culprit.

The close proximity of Eusebius' citations of Gaius' *Dialogue* with his account of the origins of the Fourth Gospel is not surprising, for throughout the third book of his *Historia Ecclesiastica* Eusebius is treading through the issue of canonical works, the very concern of Gaius' own work. Towards the beginning of Book III, Eusebius has plainly stated that as he presents his account of history he will be careful to show what the ecclesiastical writers (ἐκκλησιαστικῶν συγγραφέων) think of disputed works as well as canonical (ἐνδιαθῆκων) and accepted writings (ὁμολογουμένων; *HE* 3.3.3).

If he had read this criticism of John's Gospel in Gaius' *Dialogue*, Eusebius surely would have relayed a radically different opinion of the man whom he knows only through reading this work. However, the bonds of loyalty and esteem that he had for Origen were much stronger than any he had towards Gaius. Smith may be correct that Eusebius withholds specifying the source of this criticism in order to protect the identity of the accuser, but this reticence is best understood as a protective act on account of his fidelity to Origen, not Gaius of Rome.

Regarding Epiphanius' testimony, it is true that these objections are described as coming from a single individual (φησι—'he says'), but this does not inevitably point to Gaius, as Smith argues.<sup>59</sup> Nowhere in Epiphanius' writings does he mention any knowledge of Gaius of Rome or a *Dialogue with Proclus*, nor does he mention Montanism as an issue in his account of the criticisms of John.

Indeed, *the only textual link between a person by the name of Gaius and a rejection of the Gospel of John is from a source that post-dates Gaius of Rome by a millennium*. Even here, the evidence is far from secure.<sup>60</sup>

<sup>58</sup> Cf. Ch. 9 below.

<sup>59</sup> Smith, 'Gaius', 233; so also Ladeuze, 54.

<sup>60</sup> The only link remains the notice provided in the preface to bar Salibi's *Commentary on the Apocalypse*, that Gaius rejected John's Gospel and Apocalypse. This will be discussed at length below (see Chapter 3.6).



### 3.5.2 *Gaius, Montanism, and the Historical Context*

Further corroboration that Gaius did not reject John's Gospel is found from an historical perspective, where on a number of fronts Gaius' anti-Montanism is incompatible with anti-Johannine views. Although it is often touted, it is far from certain that the earliest Montanists pointed to the Paraclete passages in the Gospel of John to substantiate their prophetic 'gifts'.<sup>61</sup> Out of the paucity of the surviving evidence it is worth noting that Apollonius, the Anonymous and the eastern oracles do not use the term 'Paraclete'.<sup>62</sup> Nor do any of the extant prophetic utterances make any appeal to Scripture.<sup>63</sup> Furthermore, R.E. Heine has argued that there is no evidence to suggest that Phrygian Montanists utilized the Paraclete passages in support of their 'New Prophecy' in the second century.<sup>64</sup>

Such is the state of the evidence concerning the earliest years of the New Prophecy in the provenance of Asia Minor. But what about Rome at the beginning of the third century when Gaius was active? According to Heine, once Montanism moved to Rome the Gospel of John became 'a point of contention between the opposing parties'.<sup>65</sup> Heine goes on to list the 'meager' evidence to support this view: (i) Irenaeus' notice (*AH* 3.11.9); (ii) Gaius' *Dialogue with Proclus*; (iii) bar Salibi's commentaries, which Heine argues to preserve statements from Gaius' *Dialogue*; (iv) Hippolytus; (v) Ps.-Tertullian and (vi) the *Muratorian Fragment*.<sup>66</sup> However, in fact this evidence does *not* support Heine's view.

61 See F.E. Vokes 'The Use of Scripture in the Montanist Controversy,' *Studia Evangelica* 5 (1968): 317–320, where he makes a succinct and convincing case for exercising caution in presuming the use of the Fourth Gospel by early Montanists.

62 F.C. Klawiter, 'The New Prophecy in Early Christianity; the Origin, Nature and Development of Montanism, AD 165–200.' (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1975), 111, n. 1.

63 Campenhausen, *Formation*, 222.

64 R.E. Heine, 'The Gospel of John and the Montanist Debate at Rome,' *Studia Patristica* 21 (1989): 95–100; 'The Role of the Gospel of John in the Montanist Controversy,' 1–18. Cf. Campenhausen, *Formation*, 225, esp. n. 92. Smith ('Gaius,' 157–8) has to point to the fact that 'Later evidence indicates that they [Montanists] must have made substantial use of the Fourth Gospel,' but he offers no early evidence to support such an assertion. Trevett disagrees with Heine, emphasizing that there was 'an assumed relation between Christian prophecy and the presence of the Paraclete.' See Christine Trevett, *Montanism: Gender, Authority and the New Prophecy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 63.

65 Heine, 'Gospel of John in the Montanist Controversy,' 11.

66 On the *Muratorian Fragment* as a rebuttal to Gaius of Rome, see Culpepper, *John*, 129; cf. Gunther, 'Early Identifications,' 411–13.

Much, if not all, of this brings little clarity to the role of the Gospel of John in the Montanist crisis at Rome. It is far from certain that Irenaeus' notice (*AH* 3.11.9) refers directly to anti-Montanist views in the capital city, nor is John's Gospel that which is being rejected. I shall argue that it is the Paraclete and prophecy that is at the center of this antagonism, as is made clear when Irenaeus' other notice (*Dem.* 99) is considered.<sup>67</sup> It has also just been demonstrated that Gaius' *Dialogue with Proclus* did not contain a rejection or criticisms of John's Gospel; nor does bar Salibi indicate that he cites *this* work in his commentaries.<sup>68</sup> Likewise there is little extant evidence from Hippolytus that supports Heine's position. When Hippolytus does speak of the Montanists there is nothing that indicates the Gospel of John was particularly at stake beyond the use of the term Paraclete (*Ref.* 19.1–2; also 10.25 which does not contain this term). Ps.-Tertullian, not surprisingly, echoes Hippolytus' view that the Montanists claimed the Paraclete was not in the apostles, but in Montanus. However, Ps.-Tertullian also states that the Montanist claim is not necessarily based on John's Gospel, but that the Paraclete's words *exceed* those of Christ in the Gospels—'not merely more, but likewise wiser and greater' (*Adv. omn. haer.* 7.2). Finally, the *Muratorian Fragment*, perhaps also from Hippolytus, makes no connection between Montanism and the Gospel of John. It does mention that the 'number of prophets is complete', but this is immediately after a reference to the *Shepherd of Hermas*, not a Johannine work (lines 75–79). Furthermore, the *Fragment* makes no allusion to the criticisms of John that supposedly originated from Gaius. It does mention the general concern of 'different beginnings' (*uaria . . . principia*) of the Gospels, but this 'makes no difference to believers'.

Thus, returning to Heine's argument, where does one find any explicit evidence that 'the Gospel of John has become a point of contention between the opposing parties' in Rome? The problem with this calibration of the evidence is that Gaius of Rome is seen to be dominating both sides of the equation, where it is argued that Gaius of Rome, in his endeavor to eradicate Montanism, must have rejected the Johannine literature, which goes to show that the New Prophecy's use of the Fourth Gospel created a backlash within the church to the degree that some rejected it, as in the case of Gaius of Rome, and so on. The issue with this equation, aside from its dubious logic, is that the evidence mounted thus far leads away from a secure pronouncement that Gaius rejected

67 See Chapter 7.2.

68 I cannot agree with Heine's rationale ('Gospel of John in the Montanist Controversy,' 14), 'It is but a small step to assume that Gaius' denial of the Johannine authorship of the Gospel was a part of his defense against Proclus.'

the Fourth Gospel at all, and there is no concrete evidence outside of Gaius' supposed denunciation of John to support Heine's position.

If Gaius did reject John's Gospel as a means of combating Montanism, it is a massive leap to conclude that such a position was normative of Roman sentiments at the time. As T.K. Seim notes, Heine's argument 'depends on his reconstruction of an assumed Montanist counter-strategy to a certain line of critique in Rome and on an exclusive association of both Irenaeus and Tertullian with Rome—denouncing their connections with Asia Minor and knowledge about the situation there.'<sup>69</sup> Moreover, even though there is an unfortunate lack of evidence relating to Montanism in Rome during the second and early third centuries, that which has survived bears very little indication of being colored in a predominantly anti-Johannine hue.<sup>70</sup>

Strategically, one may wonder why there would be such a pull for Roman anti-Montanists to reject John's Gospel as the primary means of dispelling this sect from the church. Although the third century Montanists such as Tertullian used John's Gospel, it was not their only Scriptural proof text.<sup>71</sup> Moreover, Tertullian was in Carthage, not Rome. To banish John's Gospel as a means to eradicate the New Prophecy, then, would in itself not be the solution to the problem. If the idea was to take away this movement's textual foundations, Matthew would also be banished,<sup>72</sup> Luke would have to go,<sup>73</sup> so also would Paul's first letter to the Corinthians for, as Irenaeus argued, he too speaks of prophecy (*AH* 3.11.9; 1 Cor. 11:4–5). The rest of the Pauline corpus would also be clipped, for Trevett notes that Paul was a 'very significant source' to the Montanists, and 'both sides, catholic and Prophetic, were claiming the Pauline high ground.'<sup>74</sup> The Montanist appeal to prophetic succession that reaches back as far as the apostles places the Acts of the Apostles next in the list of works to reject.<sup>75</sup> These are just a few examples; the list goes on. Excising the

69 T.K. Seim, 'Johannine Echoes in Early Montanism,' in *The Legacy of John: Second-Century Reception of the Fourth Gospel*, ed. Tuomas Rasimus (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 353–4.

70 Cf. *ibid.*, 358. See also Brent, *Hippolytus*, 137–8.

71 *De virg. vel.* 1; cf. *De mon.* 2, 3. See Labriolle, *Sources*, 12–50.

72 Cf. the Anonymous (*ap. HE* 5.16.12) where the Montanists use Mt. 23:34 to identify their prophets and explain the ecclesiastical hostility to them.

73 Cf. Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* who appeals to Lk. 9:33 as an example of Peter not knowing what he said during the Transfiguration.

74 Trevett, *Montanism*, 130–1, who cites the 'ardent Paulinist' Abercius Marcellus' encouragement of the Anonymous' anti-Montanist activities, and Tertullian's use of Paul on marriage, prophecy and the role of women in the churches (cf. *De monog.* 14.3).

75 Cf. Miltiades (*ap. HE* 5.17.3–4). Also Acts 10:11–13 in Epiphanius (*Haer.* 48.7). See Heine, 'Gospel of John in the Montanist Controversy,' 6, 9.

possible proof texts for Montanism would be akin to a redaction of Scripture on a Marcionite scale; but this is not what happened.<sup>76</sup>

Rather, the evidence points to the fact that the methodology of the church was primarily twofold: (i) to distinguish the New Prophecy from that found in Scripture and the apostolic age, and (ii) to condemn the Montanist praxis. Concerning the first, this polemical methodology is seen in earliest opponents of Montanism in Asia,<sup>77</sup> as well as during the time of Hippolytus in Rome (*Ref.* 8.19.2) and later.<sup>78</sup> Moreover, the desire of the church towards 'testing the spirit' of the prophets, as Tabbernee notes, was nothing new in Asia Minor and can be derived from a Johannine injunction to 'test the spirits to see whether they are from God' (1 Jn. 4:1).<sup>79</sup> In two other passages that are likely directed against Montanism, at least in part, Hippolytus emphasizes that the 'divine Scriptures' (αἱ θεῖαι γραφαί) are the basis for the entire discussion (*Dan.* 4.19.1, *De Antichristo* 1–2).<sup>80</sup> Heine (along with Trevett) is surely correct in stating, 'The Roman Church did not argue with the Montanists about true or false prophecy ... It refused to grant the possibility of any prophecy after the apostles.'<sup>81</sup> Likewise, Klawiter notes that Hippolytus believed genuine prophecy is found in 'experi-

76 Contra Campenhausen who states that Gaius 'seems to have been a spokesman for the extreme anti-Montanists. As such he was not content with rejecting the 'new scriptures' of the Montanists, but strove for a revision and reduction of the whole New Testament' (*Formation*, 237).

77 E.g. The Anonymus: '[Montanus] was prophesying in a manner contrary to the constant custom of the Church handed down by tradition from the beginning' (*HE* 5.16.7). Apollonius: 'Does not all of Scripture prohibit a prophet to receive gifts and payment?' (*HE* 5.18.4). Also, Miltiades' argument that the Montanists could not claim those prophets of the New Testament (Agabus [Acts 11:28; 21:10]; Judas and Silas [both at Acts 15:32]; and most notably the daughters of Philip [Acts 21:9], which Gaius of Rome also claimed for the side of orthodoxy [*HE* 3.31.3]). Cf. also *HE* 5.17.1.

78 E.g. Epiphanius, *Haer.* 48.3.3; cf. 48.3.3–7.

79 See Tabbernee, *Fake Prophecy*, 89–90. See also Epiphanius, *Haer.* 48.1.6–7.

80 Klawiter, 211–15. Klawiter (211) argues that while the New Prophecy is not mentioned by name in either of these passages, 'It is reasonable to assume that Hippolytus' conceptions were worked out with some conscious attention given to the positions held in the New Prophecy.' See also Tabbernee, *Fake Prophecy*, 75, Labriolle, *Crise*, 147–9; Brent, *Hippolytus*, 278.

81 Heine, 'Gospel of John in the Montanist Controversy,' 15; Trevett, *Montanism*, 65. This may be seen in Hippolytus *Comm. Dan.* 4.38.1–2 as well as in the *Muratorian Fragment* where this work lists its reasons for excluding the *Shepherd of Hermas*. Yet even if the Roman Church in the third century were anti-prophecy, not just anti-Montanist, in no way does this necessarily mean that the Gospel of John was in peril.

ences [that were] gone and in the past. A Christian could do nothing better than to adhere to the deposit of that experience as found in holy scripture.<sup>82</sup>

The second strategy is more straightforward. Condemnation of the Montanist practices comes from a number of early sources such as Eusebius' Anonymous,<sup>83</sup> Apollonius<sup>84</sup> and Hippolytus.<sup>85</sup> One could also detect a third strategy, which was simply to identify the Montanists as the emissaries of Satan.<sup>86</sup>

The common assumption that Gaius' strategy was to reject the Fourth Gospel is not evidenced anywhere prior to the twelfth century writings of Dionysius bar Salibi, and it is interesting that even bar Salibi does not make a connection between a rejection of John and efforts to abolish Montanism. In fact there is no explicit evidence anywhere to suggest that the church chose to cede the Johannine corpus to the Montanists. On the contrary, later heresiologists used John's Gospel as a weapon against the Montanists. Epiphanius pits John's Gospel (5:43) against the words of Montanus to show that his teachings are in total disagreement with the sacred Scriptures, as is evident to anyone paying attention (*Haer.* 48.11.4; cf. Jn. 7:37 at 48.13.5). The 'spirit' behind the Montanist prophecy was not the Johannine Paraclete, but an evil spirit (*Haer.* 48.1.4–7, 48.2.23, 48.4.4).<sup>87</sup> Furthermore, in combating the Montanist appeal to the Gospel of John, Jerome, in a letter to Marcella, does not criticize John's Gospel, nor is he aware of any historical precedent for such a position. Rather,

82 Klawiter, 213, who bases his position on reading *Ant.* 2. See also Laura Nasrallah, 'An Ecstasy of Folly': *Prophecy and Authority in Early Christianity*. *Harvard Theological Studies* 52 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2004), 174.

83 *HE* 5.16.9 against the Montanist understanding of the role of women (so also Hippolytus, *Ref.* 8.19.2).

84 *HE* 5.18.2 against (i) the claim that Pepuza (and Tymion) would be the site of the 'new Jerusalem', (ii) their illegitimate practice of prophets requesting money, and (iii) other unseemly economic practices.

85 *Ref.* 8.19.2 against their 'novelties' of fasts (νηστείας), feasts (έορτάς), eating dried food (ξηροφαγίας), and eating radishes (ράφανοφαγίας); also *Comm. Dan.* 4.20.3 appears to be directed against the Montanists' fasting on the Sabbath, which Christ did not sanction. Cf. Labriolle, *Sources*, 12.

86 E.g. the Anonymous (*ap. HE* 5.16.7, 9); Hippolytus (*Comm. Dan.* 4.20). This went both ways, however. See Tertullian: 'Praxeas did a twofold service for the devil at Rome—he drove away prophecy and brought in heresy; he put to flight the Paraclete and crucified the Father' (*Adv. Prax.* 1). Tabbernee (*Fake Prophecy*, 87–124) divides ecclesiastical charges against Montanism into three categories: (i) Pseudo-Prophecy, (ii) Novelties, such as their 'new scriptures' and more rigoristic novelties such as fasting, 'Judaizing', etc., and (iii) Heresy.

87 See Tabbernee, *Fake Prophecy*, 88.

he demonstrates that it is to be interpreted in light of other Scripture, namely the Acts of the Apostles (*Ep.* 41).

Hermeneutical differences, therefore, is the primary issue. On this note, Allen Brent notes that despite the trend in modern exegesis to see John's promise of the Paraclete as directly supporting Montanism, in the late second and early third century, Jn. 20 was interpreted as 'limiting the charisma of the Spirit within the ordered, presbyteral/episcopal succession. The consequence of such an exegesis was that there was no need to attack the Fourth Gospel as opposed to simply reclaiming it from the Montanists who had allegedly distorted it.'<sup>88</sup> One may detect a similar trend in the writings of Irenaeus against the Gnostic use of John. In terms of the canon, the only visible textual difficulty found in the evidence concerns the unique Montanist writings that they claimed to be authoritative. The Gospel of John, however, is conspicuously absent in this debate.

What is the value of all this analysis? Both historically and textually, there is no early evidence that Gaius rejected the Fourth Gospel. Assertions to the contrary inevitably carry with them the claims of Dionysius bar Salibi and Ebed-Jesu. That these sources are not altogether reliable is the subject for the following chapter. For now, it is sufficient to recognize the fact that the predominant scholarly methodology over the past century has woven together a very compelling storyline based on incompatible evidence in which the early church was indecisive at best about accepting the Fourth Gospel. Gaius, who has stood accused of going so far as to *reject* it, has been wrongly convicted of this crime, which he never committed. The point at which there is agreement with previous scholarship is the need to rehabilitate Gaius of Rome, but *not* as a textual critic who was paradoxically 'orthodox' and 'heretical'. Rather, the rehabilitation of Gaius of Rome is back to his original legacy as a 'learned' and 'ecclesiastical' man whose battle with the Montanists served to *protect* rather than *reject* the authentic 'scriptures', including the Fourth Gospel. This, of course, means that Epiphanius' source for the *Alogi's* criticisms of the Fourth Gospel would *not* have originated from Gaius of Rome. But what about Gaius' objections to the Apocalypse?

### 3.6 Gaius and the Apocalypse

The common view that Epiphanius derived the criticisms to the Apocalypse from a lost work of Hippolytus against Gaius of Rome is not impossible, but it

---

88 Brent, *Hippolytus*, 138.

is unlikely. There are two pieces of evidence that have often been read in favor of the notion that Gaius *did* reject the Apocalypse and attribute it to Cerinthus, to which Hippolytus responded in his lost work(s).

The first comes from a portion of Gaius' *Dialogue with Proclus*, preserved by Eusebius (*HE* 3.28.1–2), where Gaius states that Cerinthus wrote an apocalyptic work under the guise of an unspecified 'great apostle'. Eusebius quotes Gaius this way:

Gaius, whose words are quoted earlier, in his disputation, investigates these things concerning this man [Cerinthus]. He writes, 'But also Cerinthus, who through revelations (ἀποκαλύψεων) as if having been written by a great apostle (ἀποστόλου μεγάλου), introduces marvellous stories to us that he falsely claims have been given to him by angels, saying after the resurrection there will come an earthly kingdom of Christ, and that flesh dwelling in Jerusalem will again be enslaved to desires and pleasures. And being hostile to the scriptures of God, desiring to lead [others] astray, he says there will be a thousand years for marriage festivities.' (*HE* 3.28.1b–3).<sup>89</sup>

Immediately following this citation of Gaius, Eusebius records this statement by Dionysius of Alexandria:

But Cerinthus...desiring trustworthy authority for his own forgery (πλάσματι), assigned the name. For this was the doctrine of his teachings: the kingdom of Christ will be on earth. And he dreamed that this would consist of those things he desired, since he was a lover of the body and altogether fleshly: satisfaction of his belly and those parts below—that is, in food and drinks and wedding feasts and through those provisions (by which he supposed to make himself more presentable) in festivals and sacrifices of holy victims. (*HE* 3.28.4–5)<sup>90</sup>

It is often suggested that Eusebius intentionally juxtaposes these two quotations in order to reflect his own opinion that Gaius must be referring to the Johannine Apocalypse. It is clear from Eusebius' lengthier citation of this portion of Dionysius' work in the seventh book of the *Historia Ecclesiastica*

89 *GCS* 9.1, 256–8. Cf. Ch. 1.3.

90 *GCS* 9.1, 258. Cf. the translation of A.F.J. Klijn and G.J. Reinink, *Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian Sects. NovTSupp*, 36 (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 103–5.



(7.25.1–2), that Dionysius is referring to the John's Apocalypse, but that does not necessarily mean Gaius of Rome does the same.

Perhaps not surprisingly, the second batch of evidence that links Epiphanius' record of the *Alogi*'s criticisms of the Apocalypse with an earlier work of Hippolytus comes from bar Salibi and Ebed-Jesu. The latter records that Hippolytus wrote a refutation of Gaius and an apologetic work in defense of the Gospel and Apocalypse of John; the former alludes to a similar Hippolytan work against Gaius, citing five criticisms of Gaius against the Apocalypse, one of which is very similar to one of the objections of the *Alogi*. These later writers are the first to attribute these concerns to Hippolytus.<sup>91</sup>

If priority is given to the later evidence, then it is all but certain that Epiphanius' source must have been a lost Hippolytan work upon which Epiphanius and bar Salibi are both reliant. However, the early evidence, examined below, tells a different story. When one carefully studies Gaius' statements, it is evident that he never rejected the Johannine Apocalypse as a Cerinthian forgery. Moreover, the similar statements of Dionysius of Alexandria ought to be considered in light of their own historical context, which makes no allusions to Gaius or the Montanist controversy.

### 3.6.1 *The Statements of Gaius*

In *HE* 3.28.1–2 Gaius never rejected *John's* Apocalypse and attributed it to Cerinthus. In light of the bar Salibi commentaries, it is natural to presume he meant John's Apocalypse; on its own merit, however, Gaius' testimony does not indicate this.<sup>92</sup> To impugn Gaius of rejecting the Johannine Apocalypse requires sautering together pieces of evidence that are otherwise totally unconnected.

In fact, there was broad and positive attestation to John's Apocalypse at this time. Thus it is safe to presume Gaius was at least aware of this work, and if he had knowledge of Cerinthus claiming John's Apocalypse as his own, one could expect Gaius to have stated as much. Also, given Eusebius' suspi-

91 See Bardy, 353; Klijn and Reinink, 4.

92 This is a point that Smith attempts to overturn by introducing 'tentative' grammatical and syntactical emendations to Eusebius' text that produce his desired reading, which is that Cerinthus supported his own doctrine from the text of John's Apocalypse. Smith ('Gaius,' 332) states that his emendations to the Greek 'are the preferred ones when examined in terms of the existing fragments themselves rather than under the umbrella of the summary statements of the later polemicists.' His overall analysis, however, is not as impartial as he suggests, and his proposed emendations are unnecessary and unsupported by the manuscript tradition.



cions about John's Apocalypse, which emerge clearly in this third book of his *Historia Ecclesiastica*,<sup>93</sup> it is likely he would have enunciated this point further if Gaius had, in fact, attributed it to Cerinthus. After all, just a few paragraphs before quoting Gaius, Eusebius twists Irenaeus' statements about the 'so-called Apocalypse of John' (ἐν τῇ Ἰωάννου λεγομένῃ Ἀποκαλύψει; HE 3.18.2). Nowhere does Irenaeus provide such a putative label. Furthermore, in HE 3.24.18 Eusebius emphasizes his view that the Apocalypse stands on shaky ground. Although he records Dionysius of Alexandria's negative views towards the Apocalypse (cf. HE 7.25), nowhere does Eusebius explicitly speak of Gaius' antagonism towards John's Apocalypse. This is odd, particularly if R.M. Grant is right in arguing, 'At this point in Book III [Eusebius] was using every available weapon to discredit the book.'<sup>94</sup>

First, Gaius does not specify the 'great apostle'.<sup>95</sup> It is feasible that this could be John the Apostle, but given the extant textual evidence it is unknown which 'great apostle' Cerinthus meant, in no way does it necessitate this conclusion. For example, one finds a different explanation emerging from the writings of Apollonius, who mentions that the Montanist Themiso wrote 'a certain catholic epistle' in imitation of 'the apostle' (HE 5.18.5). Speculation on the intended identity of this nameless apostle is rampant, ranging from I John to II Peter and Jude. Campenhausen, following Zahn, is convinced that the term 'the apostle', when absent from any specific context, must denote the apostle Paul.<sup>96</sup> If this is correct, and if Apollonius' statements are analogous, perhaps Gaius addressed the same issue in his discussion of pseudo-Pauline works (cf. HE 6.20.3).

Second, Cerinthus' claim to a sensual chiliasm in which Jerusalem would play host to the longings and desires of the flesh can hardly be derived from John's Apocalypse.<sup>97</sup> As Brent notes, Cerinthus' 'marriage festivities' (ἐν γάμῳ ἑορτῆς) have little in common with the 'marriage feast of the lamb' (τὸ δεῖπνον τοῦ γάμου τοῦ ἀρνίου; Rev. 19:9) either philologically or in the idea expressed.<sup>98</sup> Cerinthus' views are equally incompatible with another known Apocalyptic work in the early Church, the *Apocalypse of Peter*. In this work there is no view

93 Cf. Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian*, 131, who notes that Eusebius' earlier views (*viz.* in his *Chronicon*, treat the author of the Apocalypse as John the Apostle, teacher of Papias, Polycarp and Ignatius. See Helm (ed.), *GCS: Eusebius VII: Chronik Des Hieronymus* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1984), 192–4 (275–6F).

94 Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian*, 134.

95 The Paris MS (Bibliothèque Nationale 5500) of Rufinus records '*quasi apostolo*' here.

96 Campenhausen, *Formation*, 228, n. 103.

97 Contra Klijn and Reinink, 5, who argue that Gaius' references to the work he mentions 'make it almost certain that he is referring to the canonical *Apocalypse*.' Cf. Bardy, 356, n. 3.

98 Brent, *Hippolytus*, 134. Interestingly, Smith ('Gaius,' 181–2) concurs.

of a licentious millennium in a distorted Jerusalem as Cerinthus claimed, nor does it make any mention of the marriage festivities. Other pseudepigraphical apocalypses such as those of Paul and Andrew do not support Cerinthus' eschatological frivolities.<sup>99</sup>

Third, some have argued that the reference to an angel granting Cerinthus his eschatological visions is an allusion to Rev. 1:1, where Jesus imparts the revelation to John through an angel. However, just because an angel revealed these things to Cerinthus does not necessarily point to John's Apocalypse, particularly since an angelic mediator is a standard feature in the apocalyptic genre.<sup>100</sup> Furthermore, from the time of Hippolytus onward, it is recorded that Cerinthus also claimed that the Law and Prophets were given through the angels and through them the world was created (*Ref.* 10.21; *Adv. omn. haer.* 3; *Haer.* 28.1.2–3).

Finally, it may reasonably be deduced from Gaius' statement that he means Cerinthus composed *his own* 'revelations' under the guise of a pseudo-apostolic confection.<sup>101</sup> It is noteworthy that Theodoret certainly maintained the view that Cerinthus wrote his own *Apocalypse*. This is how he interprets the statements of Gaius and Dionysius: 'Cerinthus also invented certain revelations pretending to have seen them himself. Against him not only have the above-named persons written, but with them also Gaius and Dionysius the Bishop of Alexandria' (*Haer. fab. comp.* 2.3).<sup>102</sup> Moreover, O. Skarsaune has argued that Cerinthus' millennial views, as described by Dionysius of Alexandria, may have been refuted as early as Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 118.2).<sup>103</sup> Prior to bar Salibi, there is no explicit evidence to indicate Gaius means Cerinthus claimed authorship of

99 For a summary of various explanations other than assuming Gaius is speaking of the Johannine Apocalypse, see Bludau, 43ff.

100 Contra Smith ('Gaius', 182–3; cf. Bludau, 44), who argues, 'The expressions 'a great apostle' and 'revelations shown to him by an angel' create the impression generally accepted, that Gaius is referring to John the Apostle and the revelation which was mediated to him by an angel'. In contrast, a mediating angel is seen in the earliest apocalypses (e.g. Dan. 10:8–19; 1 Enoch 60:3–4) and up through those apocalyptic works that are generally contemporaneous with John's Revelation (e.g. 4 Ezra 10:29–31, 2 Enoch 2:7–8, Apoc. Abraham 11:1–6). On this issue I am indebted to the research and guidance of my friend and colleague, John Markley. See also, John J. Collins, 'Introduction: Towards a Morphology of Genre,' in *Semeia* 14 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979), 1–21, esp. 9.

101 See Bardy, 356.

102 Translation in Lightfoot, *AF* i, 11, 387. See also Brent, *Hippolytus*, 135–6.

103 O. Skarsaune, *The Proof From Prophecy, A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition: Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile*. *NovTSupp* 34, n. 2 Vol. LV1 (Leiden: Brill, 1987), 406.

the Johannine Apocalypse;<sup>104</sup> rather, his testimony as well as that of Theodoret (and possibly Justin) suggest that Cerinthus concocted his own apocalyptic work, or perhaps drastically altered that of John (or maybe Peter), to fit his own views.<sup>105</sup> Interestingly, before the emergence of the bar Salibi commentaries this was the general opinion of Routh, Westcott, and Lightfoot.<sup>106</sup>

Gaius, it should be remembered, was a 'learned' man (*HE* 6.20.3), and it is difficult to reconcile his intelligence with the strange view that Cerinthus was responsible for John's Apocalypse.<sup>107</sup> One might be tempted to postulate that if Gaius did not reject John's Apocalypse, Hippolytus would not have had any reason to write a polemic against his views. In this case, Epiphanius' statements do not necessarily reflect a lost work of Hippolytus. This, however, is getting too far ahead of the evidence. For now, it is necessary to grapple with Dionysius of Alexandria's similar statement which has prompted many to suggest that Dionysius must be referring to Gaius of Rome in his statement that 'some before us' held these views.<sup>108</sup>

### 3.6.2 *The Statements of Dionysius of Alexandria and Their Historical Context*

It is not impossible that Dionysius' testimony could reflect his own understanding of Gaius' statements, but if this is the case it must be recognized that Dionysius has gone well beyond what Gaius says. There are clear limits to what Gaius actually reports in *HE* 3.28.1–2. For example, he does not indicate which apostle Cerinthus was impersonating or that anyone rejected the Johannine Apocalypse; nor does he provide the specifics of Cerinthus' millennial hopes of pleasure. Dionysius, on the other hand, crosses these boundaries, and various others.<sup>109</sup> As Hill notes, '[I]t would seem that Eusebius has gone to the trouble

104 See Smith, 'Gaius', 333, where he agrees that Gaius did not attribute John's Apocalypse to Cerinthus, but that Hippolytus introduced this errant notion as part of his polemic against Gaius.

105 Cf. Bardy, 356, who thinks Cerinthus did not write his own work, but commented on John's.

106 Routh, 14ff.; B.F. Westcott, *A General Survey of the Canon of the New Testament*, (London: Macmillan and Co., 1875), 245, n.1; Lightfoot, 'Caius or Hippolytus?' 110.

107 Lightfoot, *AF* i, 2, 386–7. See also Brent, *Hippolytus*, 135–7; Bludau, 120–9.

108 Lightfoot, *AF*, i, 11, 386; Bludau, 50; Bardy, 361; Campenhausen, *Formation*, 237; Klijn and Reinink, 8; Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian*, 134; Smith, 'Gaius', 190. Cf. Weinrich (ed.), xviii; Hill, 'Cerinthus, Gnostic or Chiliast?' 164–5.

109 See here esp. Skarsaune, 408. Skarsaune notes that Dionysius reports Cerinthus' vision of a 're-establishment of the sacrificial cult,' which 'cannot be derived from Gaius.' See also Hill, *Johannine Corpus*, 175.

of quoting Dionysius in *Historia ecclesiastica* 3.28.1–5, and not Gaius alone, partly for the very reason that Dionysius supplies this bit of information about Cerinthus which was not available to Gaius.<sup>110</sup> If Dionysius were referring to Gaius' statements, perhaps it is a case of careless reading, or maybe he felt at liberty to re-appropriate Gaius' notice and make it more inflammatory for the situation he is addressing, which was very different than that with which Gaius was concerned, for Dionysius' notice has nothing to do with Montanism or Rome.<sup>111</sup>

Eusebius notes specifically that Dionysius wrote his work *On the Promises* as a response to the millenarian views of a certain Nepos, whose eschatological expectations approximated those of Cerinthus. Eusebius states, 'Nepos, a bishop in Egypt, taught that the promises to the saints in the Holy Scriptures are to be rendered in a more Jewish manner, teaching that there will be a thousand years of bodily luxuries upon this earth' (*HE* 7.24.1–2).<sup>112</sup> To support this notion, Nepos believed he could establish his opinions from the text of John's Apocalypse. These he wrote in a book entitled *Refutations of the Allegorists*—a clear swipe at the spiritualizing exegesis of Origen and those who followed his hermeneutical approach, such as Dionysius, who felt that it was necessary to issue a rejoinder to Nepos' views.

Nepos' eschatology had levelled a destructive force in the region of Arsinoë, Egypt, with various churches experiencing rampant schisms and apostasies. To combat these divisions, during a visit to Arsinoë Dionysius called together the ecclesial hierarchy to discuss matters. For three days he conversed with believers the views of the late Nepos and compared these with the Scriptures. The result was that the leader of the movement, Coracion, who had once affirmed Nepos' views, consented to the opinions of Dionysius and agreed to cease his chiliastic teachings.

This historical context is important, for it is after this description of the events in Arsinoë that Dionysius goes on to address the issue that 'some before us' attributed John's Apocalypse to Cerinthus. Interestingly, there is nothing in the evidence that leads to the conclusion that Montanism had been a part of the Nepos schism at all; Eusebius certainly does not make the connection.

110 C.E. Hill, 'Cerinthus, Gnostic or Chiliast? A New Solution to an Old Problem,' *J ECS* 8 (2000), 149. Hill continues (*ibid.*), 'Therefore, Skarsaune may be justified in concluding that Dionysius' information about Cerinthus' chiliasm had another source besides Gaius that is unknown to us.'

111 See Brent, *Hippolytus*, 136.

112 Perhaps Nepos was a later representative of the views against which Origen speaks in *De Princ.* 2.11.2, where he notes that some interpret the promises in a Jewish sense and believe that the future will include 'bodily pleasure and luxury'.

If Gaius' supposed attribution of John's Apocalypse to Cerinthus were a part of the equation then one would expect Eusebius to be more explicit in linking Gaius' testimony with the statements of Dionysius of Alexandria or at least align the Montanist issue with the Nepos schism.<sup>113</sup> Eusebius, however, remains totally silent and offers no reason to believe that Gaius and Dionysius' 'some before us' are directly connected.

I shall argue below that Epiphanius was reliant upon Dionysius of Alexandria for at least some of his information regarding antagonism towards the Apocalypse.<sup>114</sup> This does not mean, however, that such a link must presuppose reliance upon Gaius of Rome as the ultimate source of these objections, as is often suggested.<sup>115</sup> Such a view relies far too heavily on coincidence and fails to take into account the historical context in which Dionysius is writing and the issue he is addressing. Dionysius does not refer to Gaius by name, and his notice that 'some before us' (τινὲς μὲν οὖν τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν) in addition to the aorist plural verbs (ἠθέτησαν καὶ ἀνεσκεύασαν) suggest that this was the opinion of more than one man. It is therefore difficult to presume that Dionysius drew his information from a copy of Gaius' *Dialogue*.<sup>116</sup> Furthermore, the common denominator between Gaius' statements and those of Dionysius is not Montanism, but Cerinthus' millennial views. If Cerinthus' 'crude' chiliasm was well known, his association with both scenarios bears significant force.<sup>117</sup> Aside from this there is little commonality.

### Summary

The evidence considered in the question regarding Gaius' rejection of the Fourth Gospel and Apocalypse of John has pointed away from the standard view. As to the former, there is nothing in the testimony of Gaius himself or Eusebius' knowledge of his anti-Montanist work against Proclus to indicate that Gaius harbored any negative feelings towards this work. Furthermore, no other early writer up to the time of Epiphanius mentions anything about

113 Eusebius does juxtapose the testimonies of Gaius and Dionysius of Alexandria (*HE* 3.28.1–5), but not because they both refer to Montanism; rather it is because they share similar indictments of Cerinthus' chiliasm. When Eusebius reiterates Dionysius' testimony in fuller detail, Gaius of Rome and Montanism are nowhere to be seen.

114 See Chapter 10.3.

115 E.g., Klijn and Reinink, 8; Smith, 'Gaius', 426–7.

116 This was suggested by Bludau, 50–1, but this does not necessitate that Hippolytus and his putative work against Gaius must be the intermediary link, as Bludau supposed.

117 Cf. Skarsaune, 408; Campenhausen, *Formation*, 239; Hill, *Johannine Corpus*, 175.

a formal rejection of John's Gospel. Indeed, there are a number of scholars have agreed and expressed doubts that Gaius of Rome rejected John's Gospel.<sup>118</sup> Even if scholars remain convinced that he *did* in spite of the evidence, this does not necessarily imply a full-blown 'Johannine Controversy'.

Regarding Gaius' antagonism towards the Apocalypse, the solution that Gaius must be behind these criticisms and Hippolytus behind the responses requires the erroneous assumption that both of these figures held views that are not mentioned in any of their writings. To find an alternative solution, it is necessary to survey those writers that mention the Apocalypse prior to Epiphanius in order to determine if any of these earlier sources approximate the views Epiphanius associates with the *Alogi*.

The early evidence does not support the view of Gaius as the ecclesiastical leader who fought to eradicate the Johannine literature because of its ties to heresy. After the analysis of Smith, Gaius has become synonymous with the *Alogi*, but ironically, Smith's argument may work against the larger point he is trying to make. When he states that Gaius alone constitutes the *Alogi* and that all the evidence of criticisms of the Johannine literature and denial of their apostolic authorship can be traced back to Gaius of Rome and to no other person or group,<sup>119</sup> he actually demonstrates that the anti-Johannine sentiments that were supposedly rampant throughout the Roman church at the beginning of the third century were actually quite limited in scope.<sup>120</sup> Thus, Gaius would have been very much alone in his purported anti-Johannine sentiments, but as I have demonstrated, this was not the case. Rather, when examined carefully, the Gaian Paradox is unsustainable and his connection to the *Alogi* untenable.

The later sources that paint Gaius in a heterodox light do not comport with the earlier evidence of Gaius of Rome. Given the conflicting reports about him, there is no solid evidence to connect the *Caius haereticus* of the bar Salibi commentaries with Gaius of Rome. Thus, Lightfoot's premonition that a distinction may be drawn between *Caius* of bar Salibi lore and the 'ecclesi-

118 E.g. Harnack, *Das Neue Testament*, 63–5; Schwartz's later article, 'Johannes und Kerinthos,' 212–13; Schmidt, 436, 444–5; Stanton, 239–43; Brent, *Hippolytus*, 148.

119 Smith, 'Gaius,' 426–7.

120 Here it is worthwhile remembering the words recorded long ago by Theodore Zahn, brought back into light by Martin Hengel. Zahn, who assumed that Gaius did reject the Fourth Gospel, observes that Gaius, 'in declaring that the Johannine writings were unworthy to be in the church, acknowledged that they were in fact recognized in the church, and in attributing their authorship to Cerinthus, a contemporary of John, acknowledged that they were written in John's lifetime.' Theodore Zahn, 'Aloger,' in *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft* 3, 1 (Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 1896): 386–8, 387, cited in Hengel, *Johannine Question*, 6. Cf. Stanton, 240–3.

astical' and 'learned' Gaius of Rome is certainly plausible if not probable. The *only* evidence to support Gaius' rejection of the Johannine literature comes from the later Syrian sources. In the following chapter, it will become even more apparent that bar Salibi's notice of *Caius haereticus* is the product of his own misinterpretation or misunderstanding of the early evidence. As a result, there is ample reason to seek answers to the question of Epiphanius' source(s) elsewhere.

## Dismantling the Syrian Evidence: Dionysius bar Salibi and Ebed-Jesu

Gaius may have been exonerated from the charges of leading an anti-Johannine conspiracy, but questions still remain about the content and value of the later Syrian evidence with its claims of a certain heretic, Gaius. This, along with the resulting dubious connection of Gaius and the *Alogi*, will be the focus of this chapter.

In fact, bar Salibi himself never claims that Gaius is to be identified with the *Alogi*. The connection between Gaius and the *Alogi* is the product of modern scholarship. There are three fundamental assumptions that support the connection of Epiphanius' testimony of the *Alogi* with that of bar Salibi, which may be summarized as follows:<sup>1</sup>

- I. Hippolytus wrote a work in which he specifically attacked Gaius' rejection of the Gospel and Apocalypse of John.
  - a. This work must be an Hippolytan apologetic treatise on the Apocalypse and Gospel of John, which is evidenced by a title on the plinth of the statue of Hippolytus in Rome ([τ]ὸ ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατὰ Ἰωάννην εὐαγγελίου καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως).<sup>2</sup> It is further argued that this work listed on the statue is the same as a Hippolytan treatise listed in the fourteenth-century *Catalogue* of Ebed-Jesu (ἀπολογία ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰωάννου).<sup>3</sup>
  - b. This Hippolytan work is also identified by many scholars with another work in the *Catalogue* of Ebed-Jesu, the *Heads against Gaius* (κεφάλαια κατὰ Γαΐου), as one in the same, given their juxtaposition in the *Catalogue*.

1 See Smith, 'Gaius', 203–4, where he lists similar points that may be 'unequivocally stated on the basis of the fragments preserved by bar Salibi in his commentaries on Revelation and John.'

2 Accented Greek from Brent, *Hippolytus*, 144; modified here only in the word κατὰ. which Brent leaves without the accent.

3 Greek translation of the Syriac *Catalogue* titles (*Apology* and *Heads* in the following paragraph) is taken from Lightfoot, *AF* i, 2, 350.



- II. Epiphanius is primarily dependent upon this lost work of Hippolytus for his testimony of the *Alogi*, but he omitted Gaius' name.
- III. Dionysius bar Salibi also possessed this Hippolytan work and provided a summary of the exchange between Gaius and Hippolytus.

There are serious difficulties with each of these points. First, there is reason to question the reliability of the testimony of bar Salibi in recounting what actually happened a millennium earlier when there are no corroborating witnesses. There are also textual issues within the commentaries themselves. It is therefore necessary to establish the source(s) of bar Salibi's information. Furthermore, there are many complex issues surrounding the identification of the works listed in Ebed-Jesu's *Catalogue* with the inscription upon the chair of the statue of Hippolytus in Rome. By examining the sources for these later witnesses, it is possible to explain the reasons for the marked dissonance in the portrait of *Caius* that emerges from the commentaries of bar Salibi in contrast to what is known of Gaius of Rome from the earliest sources.

The purpose of this chapter, therefore, is to provide a careful examination of the later Syrian evidence to better understand the deep influence these testimonies have had on defining the nature, background and origins of the criticisms of the Johannine literature and their potential relationship to the Epiphanius' testimony—particularly in the identification of Gaius as the true identity of the *Alogi*. This chapter begins by addressing recent scholarship on the bar Salibi commentaries before providing a full analysis of this later Syrian evidence, beginning with Ebed-Jesu's *Catalogue*, then looking at the bar Salibi texts themselves.<sup>4</sup>

#### 4.1 Scholarship on bar Salibi's Sources

Although Bar Salibi never identifies the source of his information on the exchange between Gaius and Hippolytus of Rome, many scholars have assumed he must have utilized a lost Hippolytan work against Gaius—*Heads against Gaius*, which many have identified as the *Apology for the Gospel and Apocalypse of John*. The strongest argument for this came from a series of articles published by Pierre Prigent.

---

4 Cf. the evidence, Chapter 1.7–8.

#### 4.1.1 *Pierre Prigent*

Shortly after Smith completed his dissertation, Pierre Prigent, unaware of Smith's work, set about the task of identifying bar Salibi's use of Hippolytus throughout his *Commentary on the Apocalypse*.<sup>5</sup> Whereas Smith took for granted the fact that bar Salibi used a lost Hippolytan work for his source, Prigent set out to establish this position through textual analysis of Hippolytan works and bar Salibi's *Commentary*.<sup>6</sup>

Prigent's overall aim was to confirm the integrity of Hippolytus' citations against Gaius by demonstrating Hippolytan influence on the entirety of bar Salibi's *Commentary on the Apocalypse*. By establishing the Hippolytan character of other portions of bar Salibi's *Commentary*, Prigent would be in a position to argue that the citations that the Syrian exegete attributes to Hippolytus are genuine as well.<sup>7</sup> Yet as Gwynn and P. Nautin noted, the delimitation of Hippolytus' quotes by bar Salibi is not without difficulty, since it appears the latter has summarized the words of the former rather than provide actual citations.<sup>8</sup>

With this in mind, Prigent first traced what he maintained are concrete links between portions of bar Salibi's *Commentary on the Apocalypse* with extant texts attributed to Hippolytus, namely *On the Antichrist (Ant.)* and the *Commentary*

5 See Pierre Prigent, 'Hippolyte, Commentateur de l'Apocalypse,' *TZ* 28 (1972), 391–412; Prigent and R. Stehly, 'Les Fragments du De Apocalypsi d'Hippolyte,' *TZ* 29 (1973), 313–333; Prigent and R. Stehly, 'Citations d'Hippolyte trouvée dans le ms. Bodl. Syr 140,' *TZ* 30 (1974), 82–85.

6 Prigent concurred with Harris' notion that the marginal note indicated that 'Gaius' was the heretic in question. He also offered two additional fragments from bar Salibi's commentary on Revelation that were discovered subsequent to the publication of the CSCO edition edited by I. Sedlacek, which he argued are from the putative work, *Heads against Gaius*. The first additional bar Salibi fragment from Prigent comes from the prologue of his commentary and is very similar to that of Robinson's discovery. See Fragment 00 (Prigent, 'Hippolyte,' 407) where he highlights the likelihood that the first fragment (00) is 'precisely the character of the work of Hippolytus that one could well qualify as an *Apology* of the Gospel and Apocalypse of John in response to the allegations of Gaius.' The second fragment (01), from bar Salibi's commentary on Rev. 1:4, 'must come from the same work of Hippolytus.' See *ibid.*, 408. This fragment is provided by Prigent as: « Hippolyte dit: 'Quand il a écrit, il a écrit à sept églises, comme Paul qui a écrit ses treize lettres à sept églises.' Celle aux Hébreux, il ne reconnaît pas qu'elle est de Paul, mais de Clément peut-être. » Cf. Nautin, *Dossier*, 145; *Comm. Apoc.*, 2–3.

7 'De nombreux passages du commentaire sont en réalité des extraits d'oeuvres hippolytiennes bien que rien ne vienne signaler leur origine. De plus certaines interprétations sont indéniablement marquées au coin de l'exégèse hippolytienne. Il faudra donc élargir la question et poser le problème de la composition du commentaire de Denys: Doit-on y déceler les traces du *De Apocalypsi* d'Hippolyte?' *Ibid.*, 392. Cf. Brent, *Hippolytus*, 150.

8 Gwynn, 404; Nautin, *Dossier*, 146.

on *Daniel* (*Dan.*).<sup>9</sup> Prigent also considered another possible Hippolytan source for bar Salibi's commentary, the work entitled *De Apocalypsi* mentioned by Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 61) and his successors (Sophronius, Nicephorus Callistus and George Syncellus). In 1897 H. Achelis had published twenty-two Hippolytan fragments, which he attributed to this lost work.<sup>10</sup> But Prigent argued that *De Apocalypsi* was nothing more than a fictitious work presumed to exist by these various writers throughout Christian history.<sup>11</sup> Thus, *De Apocalypsi* is a spurious title given to what is actually a florilegium of *Dan.* and *Ant.* in conjunction with what he argues is the authentic, lost Hippolytan *Apology*, which Prigent held to be identical to the work Ebed-Jesu listed as *Heads against Gaius*.<sup>12</sup> According to Prigent, the *Catalogue* of Ebed-Jesu has 'only relative value' and one should not distinguish between these two works.<sup>13</sup>

This raises a crucial question. Did the citations that bar Salibi attributes to Gaius and Hippolytus really come from a distinct work (*Heads against Gaius*), or did bar Salibi derive these from a florilegium as well? In other words, is it possible that the *Heads against Gaius* is not a distinct work but part of this catena tradition? Prigent rejected this notion, arguing that the citations of Hippolytus against Gaius are genuine and derive from this lost work because they have 'precisely the character of an apologetic work'.<sup>14</sup> He therefore bet on the veracity of the notices of the existence of the *Apology* found in the *Catalogue* of Ebed-Jesu and (presumably) the same work found on the Statue over against the testimonies of Jerome and others that speak of the authenticity of the work *De Apocalypsi*.<sup>15</sup>

To prove the authenticity of Hippolytus' polemic against Gaius in the bar Salibi commentary, Prigent pointed to two extant fragments that he believed

9 Prigent, 'Hippolyte,' 392ff.

10 Achelis used quotations from the translation by R. Payne Smith of *Ms. Bodl. Syr.* 140 as well as *Ms. Parisinus arab.* 67. H. Achelis, *Hippolytus Werke* Band 1, 2 *Hippolyt's kleinere exegetische und homiletische Schriften*, GCS (1897), 231–238. See also J. Schmid, *Studien zur Geschichte des Griechischen Apokalypse-Textes*. 1. *Der Apokalypse-Kommentar des Andreas von Kaisareia* (München: K. Zink, 1955–1956).

11 Prigent, 'Hippolyte,' 395–403.

12 Prigent and Stehly, 'Citations,' 84–5; idem, 'Les fragments,' 333; 316.

13 Prigent, 'Hippolyte,' 411–412; cf. Nautin, 146–147: 'On s'abstiendra donc désormais de considérer les « chapitres contre Caïus » comme un ouvrage distinct de l'*Apologie de l'Apocalypse* et de l'*Évangile de Jean*.'

14 Prigent, 'Hippolyte,' 407, 411–12.

15 'On ne retiendra du témoignage de Denys (et d'Ebed Jesu) qu'une seule chose: Hippolyte a écrit, en répondant à Caïus, une *Apologie de l'Apocalypse* et de l'*Évangile de Jean*.' Prigent, 'Hippolyte,' 412.

were derived from the lost *Heads against Gaius*, but which Achelis wrongly categorized under the title *De Apocalypsi*.<sup>16</sup> Achelis lists Frag. 11 as a commentary on Rev. 10:2–4, but as Prigent notes it is more likely a reference to Rev. 7:9–17, referring to the tribulation (cf. Mt. 24:21).<sup>17</sup> Prigent argued that this fragment shows a degree of a polemical context, and he suggests that it fits with bar Salibi's record of Hippolytus' statements on Rev. 11:2, where he discusses this Matthean verse as well.

The second Achelis fragment that Prigent examined is Frag. 1X on Rev. 12:16.<sup>18</sup> The context of this passage is that of the woman and the dragon (Satan), where the earth aids the woman in her flight from the dragon. In this Arabic fragment, two interpretations are given: one literal, one symbolic. The author of the fragment only attributes the latter to Hippolytus, but Prigent believed both belong to him. Prigent argued that these interpretations represent exegesis that is characteristic of an *Apology*, and that there are parallels with bar Salibi's citations of Hippolytus' refutations of Gaius elsewhere.<sup>19</sup>

However, Prigent noted that there were some difficulties with his argument for bar Salibi's dependence upon the lost *Heads against Gaius*. He recognized that some of bar Salibi's statements have strong affinities to what is actually found in Irenaeus. But these, he argued, must have been relayed through Hippolytus as intermediary.<sup>20</sup> Other portions of bar Salibi's commentary on Revelation had no parallel with any extant Hippolytan work at all. He nevertheless maintained his argument that those fragments that bar Salibi directly attributes to Hippolytus must be authentic since Hippolytan influence was seen elsewhere, and since these responses to Gaius have precisely the character of an *Apology*, they must have derived from Hippolytus' refutation of Gaius (*Apology*).<sup>21</sup> Prigent thus concluded that bar Salibi's *Commentary on*

16 Achelis, *Hippolyt's Kleinere Exegetische und Homiletische Schriften*, GCS (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1897), 232–8.

17 Prigent, 'Les Fragments,' 321; cf. Brent, *Hippolytus*, 158.

18 Achelis, 233 (esp. lines 11–13): 'Wenn es heisst: 'Und die Erde öffnete ihren Mund, und verschlang den Wasserstrom, welchen der Drache dem Weibe nachwarf', so lässt das, dass die Erde die ausgesandten Heere verschlang, zwei Deutungen zu. Die eine ist die äusserliche, so dass es ihnen ergangen wäre wie einst den Korachiten, als die Erde sich aufthat, und sie in ihre Tiefen stürzten, und sie sie zudeckte. Und die andere ist, dass man so erklärt, dass das 'sie verschlang dieselben' so viel ist als: sie (die Heere) irrten auf ihr umher und kamen von ihrem Marschziel ab. Diese (letzttere) hat Hippolytus.'

19 Prigent, 'Les Fragments,' 325. He finds parallels with Rev. 8:8 on the plagues of Egypt, Rev. 8:11 on the miracle of Mara, Rev. 8:12 on the Flood as a prophecy of the last things.

20 Prigent, 'Hippolyte', 404–7, 411.

21 Ibid., 407.

*the Apocalypse* is composed partially from quotations derived from *Ant.*, what appears to be a citation from *Dan*, and the rest—more than two-thirds of bar Salibi's statements—come from Hippolytus' lost *Apology* of the Gospel and Apocalypse of John in response to Gaius.<sup>22</sup>

Prigent's case for the authenticity of the Hippolytan fragments in the bar Salibi commentaries is compelling, and if his analysis is correct, bar Salibi is the lone witness to explicitly record anything from the lost work of Hippolytus against Gaius. Furthermore, given the similar criticism against the Apocalypse of John along with another against John's Gospel in the writings of bar Salibi and Epiphanius, it could be possible to forge a direct textual link between bar Salibi's Gaius and Epiphanius' *Alogi*. In other words, it would appear that Prigent had proven Smith's argument that both Epiphanius and bar Salibi were dependent upon the same Hippolytan source. However, Allen Brent's work may have overturned much of what Prigent sought to establish.

#### 4.1.2 *Allen Brent*

After examining Prigent's analysis and conclusions, Allen Brent determined that Hippolytus' influence throughout bar Salibi's *Commentary* may not be as strong as Prigent maintained. The primary target of Brent's counter argument is Prigent's unfounded suppositions that the lost *De Apocalypsi* was a florilegium, but that the *Apology*, which comprised part of that florilegium, was itself genuine, and the source of bar Salibi's quotations of Hippolytus against Gaius.<sup>23</sup>

Brent agrees with Prigent that many of bar Salibi's citations derive from known works (namely *Dan.* and *Ant.*), and sometimes they have been 'garbled and distorted' to the extent that they are ultimately derived from a florilegium of Hippolytan apocalyptic writings.<sup>24</sup> Thus, Brent finds common ground with Prigent in that the *De Apocalypsi* may not be genuine at all. But given the dates of the manuscripts examined by Prigent, bar Salibi would have had access to a similar florilegium of Hippolytan writings, in which case bar Salibi could have used Hippolytus' works (*Dan.* and *Ant.*) directly in some instances, but in others it is possible that bar Salibi may reflect 'the garbled hermeneutic represented by such *florilegia*.'<sup>25</sup> Therefore, there is no reason to assume with

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., 411.

<sup>23</sup> Brent, *Hippolytus*, 151. Brent finds it 'interesting... to consider precisely why [Prigent] held the *De Apocalypsi* to be a spurious construction, and yet held that the κεφάλαια [=Apology] were genuine even if they came down to us themselves via such a florilegium.'

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., 159, see esp. n. 158.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., 161.

Prigent that the *Heads against Gaius* was an authentic component part of the same florilegium of Hippolytan extracts.<sup>26</sup>

What about Prigent's argument that two of Achelis' fragments must have come from the lost *Apology* from Hippolytus? The first of these is Frag. 11, but the content of this fragment does not actually square with the passage in bar Salibi. In the Arabic fragment listed by Achelis, Hippolytus claims that the prophecy applies to the general resurrection and not to the Maccabees.<sup>27</sup> In bar Salibi, Hippolytus argues that Mt. 24:21 rejects the application of this verse to the taking of Jerusalem by Vespasian.<sup>28</sup> Moreover, no objection to this verse by Gaius or anyone else is noted in bar Salibi's *Commentary*.

Furthermore, Brent finds Prigent's argument for second fragment (Frag. IX) as part of the *Heads against Gaius* 'particularly weak'.<sup>29</sup> The parallels that Prigent sought to draw between this fragment and Hippolytus' refutations of Gaius are not unique. Rather, Brent notes that they 'are too common to apocalyptic hermeneutic in general to yield any specific parallel'.<sup>30</sup> Thus, Brent argues, these two fragments do not prove the existence of an authentic work (*Heads*) as part of the florilegium.

Upon reading the summary statements at the beginning of his *Commentary on the Apocalypse* it is a fair inference that bar Salibi paints the dispute between Gaius and Hippolytus as having been derived from a work in which Hippolytus was the author.<sup>31</sup> What possible Hippolytan text could have served as bar Salibi's source? *Dan.* and *Ant.* demonstrate no such parallels with any

26 'But Prigent insisted nevertheless that the κεφάλαια is genuine and not itself the product of a similar process of literary transmission [as *De Apocalypsi*]. We need to ask whether in that case Prigent may be wrong in concluding that sometimes Barsalibi is quoting from these two works as part of his own commentary, but in other parts, those directed at Gaius, from the κεφάλαια as a genuine work. The κεφάλαια may well be the product of such secondary material whose garbled character has produced, as in the case of the putative *De Apocalypsi*, the illusion of being citations from a genuine lost work.' Brent, *Hippolytus*, 161.

27 Achelis, 230: [Fragment] 11. Apok. Joh. 10, 1–7. Hippolytus, der römische Bischof, tritt der Ansicht bei, dass die erwähnte Weissagung auf diejenigen toten, die auferstehen, gehe, und nicht auf die Makkabäer.

28 *Comm. Apoc.* 13 (Rev. 11:2): 'Erit oppressio, qualis non fuit similes ab initio mundi, et cetera; h. e. dixit Hippolytus: Hoc non evenisse in obsidione Vespasiani, non enim accidit quidquam novi in mundo in diebus eius, praeter ea, quae iam antea evererant...'

29 Brent, *Hippolytus*, 159.

30 Ibid.

31 E.g., *Hippolytus Romanus dixit: Apparuit vir, nomine Caius, qui asserebat Evangelium non esse Iohannis, nec Apocalypsim, sed Cerinthi haeretici ea esse. Comm. Apoc. praef.* (1–2).

citations by bar Salibi regarding the contest between Gaius and Hippolytus. Both Prigent and Brent agree that *De Apocalypsi* is most likely a fabricated title for a catena of Hippolytan extracts. By process of elimination, then, one must turn to the possibility that bar Salibi used a Hippolytan work under the title *Apology* and/or *Heads against Gaius*, noted in Ebed-Jesu's *Catalogue*. Given the lack of any extant manuscript from such a work, Prigent himself can only infer that since these citations imply a dispute and refutation, they must derive from such a work. Yet there is another possibility to this supposition.

Brent points out that the notion that Hippolytus would have referred to himself as *Hippolytus Romanus* is very odd, and the self-proclaimed designation as *beatus Hippolytus* is even more bizarre.<sup>32</sup> He also notes that 'there is no evidence before Epiphanius that an opponent of the *Apocalypse* deserved the description Γαίος ὁ αἵρετικός rather than—and as late as Eusebius—λογιωτάτος or ἐκκλησιαστικός ἀνὴρ.<sup>33</sup> Nor does bar Salibi's record of this dialogue find any viable parallels with the standard literary forms of the time, seen for example in Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* or Origen's *Contra Celsum*.<sup>34</sup>

Rather than presuming reliance upon a lost Hippolytan work, Brent argues that the supposedly Hippolytan elements in bar Salibi's *Commentary* may actually reflect a strand of Hippolytan pseudepigrapha that is evidenced in other Eastern writings.<sup>35</sup> Brent points to the works κατὰ Βήρωνος καὶ Ἡλικος, περὶ τῆς συντελείας τοῦ κόσμου and εἰς τὰ ἅγια θεοφάνεια as examples of such pseudepigrapha, the first of which is part of a florilegium entitled *Doctrina Patrum*.<sup>36</sup> Hippolytus was a frequent pseudonym for various works in the East and therefore bar Salibi's *Commentary* could have drawn from this preceding context.

Finally, Brent suggests that bar Salibi used *Hippolytus Romanus* as a cipher for the 'orthodox' position in the squabble over the integrity of the Johannine writings. For support, he lists six works from Eastern writers that portray Hippolytus anachronistically as a representative of the apostolic age:

32 Brent, *Hippolytus*, 149, 176.

33 Ibid., 149.

34 Cf. Smith, 'Gaius', 285–6.

35 Brent, *Hippolytus*, 178.

36 *PG* x col. 829–852; *PG* x col. 903–952; and Achelis, 255–263 (respectively). Brent also points out the pseudepigraphic works of the Arabic Pentateuch with commentaries by the Fathers in *ms. Hutling* 84 and *ms. Bodleian* NE c. 33, printed in Fabricius' edition of the works of Hippolytus. See Brent, *Hippolytus*, 178, esp. n. 193; J.A.S. Fabricius *Hippolyti Opera non antea collecta* (Hamburg: Christian Liebezeit, 1716). Critical edition by Franz Diekamp, *Doctrina Patrum de incarnatione verbi. Ein griechisches Florilegium aus der Wende des 7. und 8. Jahrhunderts* (Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1907).



Theodoret, Palladius, Andreas of Caesarea, Cyrillus of Scythopolis, Leontius of Byzantium and Pseudo-Chrysostom.<sup>37</sup>

What is the bearing of all this for the bar Salibi commentaries? Regarding the question of bar Salibi's source(s), Brent's analysis introduces another plausible explanation that does not require attributing bar Salibi's work to a lost work of Hippolytus that may never have existed at all. Rather, bar Salibi could have employed Hippolytus as an orthodox 'everyman' and Gaius the heretical counterpart for a fictitious dialogue created by none other than bar Salibi himself and in support of which there is no historical evidence.<sup>38</sup>

There are, however, pieces of evidence that would stand in the way of Brent's position. The first is the *Catalogue* of Ebed-Jesu, which attributes both the works *Heads against Gaius* and the *Apology* to Hippolytus. It is possible, though very unlikely, that Ebed-Jesu knew of an Hippolytan work by this title that went unmentioned by those familiar with Hippolytus' works for over a millennium. Brent favors the view of P. Nautin, that Ebed-Jesu manufactured this title as a gloss for what he derived from his own reading of the contest of Gaius and Hippolytus in bar Salibi's *Commentary*.<sup>39</sup> Thus, both internal and external considerations preclude the *Heads against Gaius* and the *Apology*, 'from being anything else than a general exegetical tradition dressed up pseudepigraphically under the cipher-names of "Hippolytus" and "Gaius"'.<sup>40</sup>

The second evidentiary obstacle to Brent's view is the Statue of Hippolytus and its list of possibly Hippolytan works, one of which pertains to the Gospel and Apocalypse of John. He argues that the title on the Statue does not necessitate that the work is of an apologetic genre.<sup>41</sup> From the title alone, the purpose and content of this work is entirely unknown. In the following chapter I shall argue that it is entirely plausible that it was concerned with the question of authorship of these works rather than an apology.<sup>42</sup> Thus, for Brent, there is little reason to suggest equivalence between the title of the work mentioned by Ebed-Jesu and that of the Statue.<sup>43</sup>

Brent has levelled some heavy and, in some instances, decisive blows to Prigent's attempt to verify the integrity of the Hippolytan quotations in bar Salibi's writings. Although Brent shows no awareness of Smith's work at all,

37 See Brent, *Hippolytus*, 183 for full citations of works and dates.

38 Brent, *Hippolytus*, 183.

39 Ibid., 170–74. See also Nautin, *Dossier*, 146.

40 Brent, *Hippolytus*, 184.

41 Ibid., 172.

42 Cf. Chapter 5.2.

43 Brent, *Hippolytus*, 172.



by way of association his argument has also sustained critical damage. The most salient contributions to the question of bar Salibi's sources that Brent provides are: (i) the arguments against the authenticity of the work *Heads against Gaius* as a component of what is clearly admitted on all sides as a florilegium, and (ii) the recognition of the likelihood that the later Syrian work may be explained by evidence that is in closer to the time of the composition of these writings (such as the pseudo-Hippolytan works and Ebed-Jesu's reliance upon later commentaries for his information on Hippolytus), rather than the earliest sources.

There are, however, notable weaknesses in Brent's argument. For example, just because figures ranging from Theodoret in the fifth century to Leontius of Byzantium in the seventh make Hippolytus to be a hero of the patristic era, this does not mean that five or six centuries later bar Salibi does the same. Also, while Brent's explanation for why bar Salibi manufactured a debate between Gaius and Hippolytus as the orthodox and heretical 'everyman' is compelling, it does not adequately explain the reason why bar Salibi chose to pit *these two figures* against one another in the form of a debate. If Gaius was conceived to be the heretical 'everyman', bar Salibi could have simply used the unspecified *haereticus* as he does elsewhere rather than putting a name to this figure. It is important to remember that bar Salibi paints an *historical* portrait of this contest between Gaius and Hippolytus. The question is whether his read on early church history is accurate, or did he misinterpret the early sources, or did he manipulate his sources to reflect what he wanted them to say? Another possibility is that bar Salibi was the beneficiary of other, later accounts that were garbled but which he took to be historically accurate.

Thus far, it is clear that the standard explanation of bar Salibi's sources, as articulated by Prigent and Smith, does not add up. Brent's counter-proposal is plausible and does a better job of explaining the evidence than Prigent's argument, but it still requires modification. Thus, other items must be considered. First, the veracity of Ebed-Jesu's *Catalogue* will be examined before looking more carefully at the commentaries of bar Salibi.

#### 4.2 The *Catalogue* of Ebed-Jesu

Ebed-Jesu's *Catalogue*<sup>44</sup> is a curious bit of writing. He records a short list of works by a person he knows only as 'Hippolytus, Bishop and Martyr'—a designation identical to that recorded by Theodoret (*Haer. fab. comp.* 3.1;

44 For Ebed-Jesu's *Catalogue* of Hippolytan works, see *BO* III.1, 15.

*Dial.* 1–3) and Photius (*Bibl.* 202).<sup>45</sup> Included in this list are works that are otherwise unattested *anywhere* in the history of Christianity, namely the *Heads against Gaius* and *Apology for the Apocalypse and Gospel of John*. But how trustworthy is this account, and are these works authentic?

#### 4.2.1 *The Catalogue and the Omission of Known Hippolytan Works*

One puzzling feature of the *Catalogue* is the absence of any mention of other well-known, extant works by Hippolytus. For example, why does Ebed-Jesu not include any of the Hippolytan works mentioned by Eusebius or Jerome? After noting his work on the chronology of the paschal feasts, Eusebius lists these Hippolytan works: *On the Hexaemeron*, *On the Works after the Hexaemeron*, *Against Marcion*, *On the Song of Songs*, *On Portions of Ezekiel*, *On the Passover* and *Against All Heresies* (*HE* 6.22).<sup>46</sup> As with Eusebius, Jerome knows of Hippolytus as a bishop, but is unaware of the location of his See. Jerome notes a number of Hippolytan works cited by Eusebius (*Against Marcion*, *Against All Heresies*, *On the Passover*, *On the Song of Songs*), but he also records additional works by Hippolytus not found in Eusebius' record: *On Exodus*, *On Genesis*, *On Zechariah*, *On the Psalms*, *On Isaiah*, *On Daniel*, *On Proverbs*, *On Ecclesiastes*, the putative *On the Apocalypse* (*De Apocalypsi*), *On the Resurrection*, *On the Pythonissa* and *On the Praise of our Lord and Savior* (*De vir. ill.* 61).

It is puzzling that Ebed-Jesu failed to record at least some of these well-known, well-attested works. After all, Ebed-Jesu's contemporary, Nicephorus Callistus (ca. 1300), provides a lengthy list of corroborated Hippolytan works in his *Ecclesiastical History* (4.31).<sup>47</sup> Moreover, Nicephorus' list makes no mention of any such *Apology* or *Heads against Gaius*. Indeed, if one reads Lightfoot's<sup>48</sup> detailed listing of ancient references to a person named 'Hippolytus', it is clear that this apologetic work listed by Ebed-Jesu is unattested by any other writer who mentions a certain Hippolytus—even where there may exist confusion over multiple identities that may have shared the same name.

#### 4.2.2 *The Catalogue and the Dubious Link with Known Hippolytan Works*

What about the other works that Ebed-Jesu attributes to Hippolytus? Is it possible to authenticate these as certifiably Hippolytan? Ebed-Jesu lists a peculiar work entitled ἐρμηνείαν Δανιὴλ τοῦ μικροῦ καὶ Σοθῶννας ('Interpretation

45 See J.A. Cerrato, *Hippolytus Between East and West: The Commentaries and Provenance of the Corpus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 13.

46 Cf. *Ibid.*, 28–33; Brent, *Hippolytus*, 391–2.

47 For his list of Hippolytan works, see the excerpt in Lightfoot, *AF* i, 2, 349–50.

48 *Ibid.*, 318–65.

of *Little Daniel* and *Susannah*'). Strictly speaking no such work under the title *Little Daniel* (or *Young Daniel*) emerges from any of the early sources. There is a Syriac manuscript that bears the title *Little Daniel*, a text which is commonly dated no later than the beginning of the third century; but this is dating based exclusively on the testimony of Ebed-Jesu.<sup>49</sup>

According to W. Wright, the only available manuscript of this work is dated to the twelfth century.<sup>50</sup> H. Schmoldt, whose unpublished Ph.D. dissertation examined this manuscript, notes that the *Young Daniel* is a composite, redacted work comprised of two primary components, the bulk of which is the apocalyptic sections that are Jewish and may date from the first or second centuries, the other sections are Christian and represent a later addition.<sup>51</sup> Lightfoot himself examined a fragment of this work in Wright's *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts*, and surmised this *Little Daniel* is 'a distinctly Christian apocryphal writing'.<sup>52</sup>

The question naturally presents itself, which work did Ebed-Jesu intend in his notice of Hippolytan works? Is it possible that Ebed-Jesu meant Hippolytus' well-known *Commentary on Daniel*? In this case one would expect to find some precedent of Ebed-Jesu's version of this title (in reference to the *Commentary on Daniel*) in the various extant lists of Hippolytan works, but there is none. Perhaps the two works are markedly similar such that confusion in content may lead to confusion in titles. Yet here it is worth noting that the extant manuscript of *Little Daniel* is composed almost entirely in poetic meter;<sup>53</sup> Hippolytus' *Dan* is not. Thus the difference in genre excludes questions of equivalence between these works.

Moreover, what about Ebed-Jesu's inclusion of the work *Susannah*? At the beginning of *Dan.*, Hippolytus refers to the LXX addition *Susannah* as 'Scripture' (*Dan.* 1.5.1). If Ebed-Jesu had actually read Hippolytus' *Dan.*, and if this is the work he intended under the title *Little Daniel*, this may partially explain his addition of the title *Susannah*. However, if Ebed-Jesu had indeed read *Dan.*, he would have known the proper title of this work.

49 See Lorenzo DiTommaso, *The Book of Daniel and the Apocryphal Daniel Literature*. *Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha*, Vol. 20 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 108–113.

50 British Library, *cod. Add.* 18715 fols. 239v–241r, listed in W. Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum Acquired Since the Year 1838* (London, 1870), No. XXXII, 1.19.

51 See H. Schmoldt, 'Die Schrift 'Vom jungen Daniel' und 'Daniels letzte Vision.' herausgabe und Interpretation zweier apokalyptischer Texte.' (Ph.D. Diss.: Hamburg, 1972), 106–113, cited in DiTommaso, 109.

52 Lightfoot, *AF* i, 2, 393.

53 DiTommaso, 109.

The other possibility is that Ebed-Jesu is relying heavily on relatively recent information and equating it with similar, but different, evidence from much earlier. Hippolytus' *Commentary on Daniel* was well known, and Ebed-Jesu's knowledge of the Syriac *Little Daniel*, which is clearly evidenced by the MS tradition as being available during his time, may have created a problem of equivocation. The fact that Ebed-Jesu chose to record the title *Little Daniel* rather than *Daniel* lends itself to the fact that he was unfamiliar with the authentic Hippolytan work. This is confirmed by his listing of *Susannah* as a separate work, for, as Lightfoot noted, whereas the Greek additions to Daniel (*Susannah*, the *Three Children*, *Bel and the Dragon*) are normally included under the title Daniel, Ebed-Jesu separates *Susannah* as unique.<sup>54</sup>

Finally, what does one do with the other title listed by Ebed-Jesu and translated by Lightfoot as the *περὶ οἰκονομίας*? There is a work listed on the Statue in Rome whose first part is destroyed and appears as [—] *νίας*. However, there is simply not enough to connect these two without a generous dose of speculation. Lightfoot hypothesized that this refers to the work listed on the Statue *in addition to* Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 61): *A Homily on the praise of our Lord and Saviour* (*προσομιλία de Laude Domini Salvatoris*), which Jerome states was delivered by Hippolytus in the presence of Origen.<sup>55</sup> Brent argues that this title very well may reflect the Hippolytan pseudepigrapha of this time, especially since the use of *οἰκονομία* was a 'particularly Eastern commonplace' term at this time for the trinitarian mystery by Ebed-Jesu's time.<sup>56</sup>

There is, therefore, good reason to exercise great caution in presuming the authenticity of Ebed-Jesu's list of Hippolytan works. The fact is, in a strict sense, and taken as they appear in his *Catalogue*, none of the five works he attributes to Hippolytus are corroborated by any other witness. Whereas there are traces of similarity between some of his titles with early lists of Hippolytan works, these are not enough to confidently identify them as the same. Moreover, those well-known works of Hippolytus noted by Eusebius, Jerome and others make *no* appearance in Ebed-Jesu's list whatsoever. This is particularly strange given that Ebed-Jesu lists the '*librum Historiae Ecclesiasticae*' in his *Catalogue* of Eusebian works.<sup>57</sup> Finally, it should be noted that the bulk of the extant explanatory evidence derives from sources that are contemporaneous with Ebed-Jesu, not those from the early church. Having examined these other works, it is to the final two titles in this *Catalogue* that we now turn.

54 Lightfoot, *AF* i, 2, 393.

55 Lightfoot, *AF* i, 2, 398, 423.

56 Brent, *Hippolytus*, 345.

57 *BO* III.1, 18.

#### 4.2.3 *The Catalogue and the Apology/Heads against Gaius*

In light of the preceding analysis, the works *Apology* and *Heads against Gaius* should not automatically be granted absolute value as genuine works of Hippolytus, particularly as no early source professes to know anything about either of these works. As noted earlier, the *Apology* has been associated with the title on the plinth of the statue of Hippolytus, but it is far from certain that the title on the statue is an apologetic work. The two titles also do not correspond precisely: the names of the Johannine works are in reverse order from those listed on the statue. Moreover, there is nothing to indicate the work on the Statue was an apologetic work.<sup>58</sup>

As with the other titles on Ebed-Jesu's list of Hippolytan works, however, there is an explanation from sources that are much closer to the time of Ebed-Jesu. The argument originally noted by Nautin—that Ebed-Jesu did not actually possess a copy of the *Apology* or *Heads*, but simply surmised their existence after reading bar Salibi's *Commentary*—is very compelling and in all probability correct. In this case Ebed-Jesu would have presumed the existence of the former work from reading bar Salibi's preface, and the latter from the dialogue between Gaius and Hippolytus in the main body of the text.

Is it likely that Nautin is correct and Ebed-Jesu derived his knowledge of these supposedly Hippolytan works from bar Salibi's commentaries? If so, where did bar Salibi get *his* information? It is clear that he has utilized a Hippolytan florilegium for much of his *Commentary*. Prigent admitted this, but maintained that a portion of this florilegium is the authentic work *Heads against Gaius*. Thus, bar Salibi's *Commentary* is the only known source that may authenticate this putative work. In order to establish the fact that this work was not the source of bar Salibi's commentaries, it is necessary to establish the sources of this *Commentary*. If it is possible to demonstrate that bar Salibi has not used a singular source for his report of a Gaius/Hippolytus dispute, then Ebed-Jesu's *Catalogue* of Hippolytan titles will be confirmed as spurious.

### 4.3 Dionysius bar Salibi: A Closer Look at the Evidence

Much attention has been paid to the relationship of bar Salibi's writings with Patristic sources, but what can one deduce from looking at the bar Salibi evidence on its own? What features are unique to the way in which bar Salibi composed his writings? He is, after all, separated from the Patristic era by a vast

<sup>58</sup> For a convenient chart listing the Hippolytan works by Eusebius, Jerome, the Statue and Ebed-Jesu, see Lightfoot, *AF* i, 2, 420–1.

amount of time, and thus it is naïve to presume his own concerns, methodology and genre of writing are identical to those of the early Fathers. By understanding the unique aspects of bar Salibi's commentaries, the relationship between these writings and the earliest evidence will become much clearer.

In what follows I shall argue for the likelihood that bar Salibi has manufactured the dispute between Gaius and Hippolytus based on his sources, which is primarily a garbled catena, part of which is dependent upon Epiphanius' testimony of the *Alogi*. Finally, I shall conclude with an analysis of the relationship between Epiphanius' *Alogi* and bar Salibi's Gaius.

#### 4.3.1 *The Criticism-Response Form of Bar Salibi's Writings*

It is true that bar Salibi contextualizes the criticisms of Gaius as part of a dispute with Hippolytus. Gaius objects to elements he has found in the Johannine record, typically due to elements of incompatibility with other Scripture. Hippolytus, in turn, provides a rebuttal in defense of the compatibility of these texts. Scholars have made far too much of this. For Prigent, Hippolytus' responses had the precise nature of what would be recorded in an *Apology*, and therefore the work *Heads against Gaius/Apology* must be bar Salibi's source. Concerning Gaius' objections, J.D. Smith argues, 'The significance of the formulation and role of the objections which Gaius raised against the Gospel of John and Revelation cannot be overestimated.'<sup>59</sup> Yet, this is precisely what Smith proceeds to do.

Smith argues that the form and content of the dialogue between Gaius and Hippolytus as recorded by bar Salibi offers unique insights into the nature of Gaius' *Dialogue*. Moreover, he makes the dubious assertion that there are discernible parallels between bar Salibi's introductory formulae with that of Epiphanius: the former beginning with '*Caius the heretic objected...*', the latter with 'he says...'.<sup>60</sup> Smith's analysis digresses into further speculative assertions about the nature and mode of the 'elegant rhetorical question form' of the objections, as though the conflict bar Salibi records between Gaius and Hippolytus was of such a unique calibre that it is unparalleled anywhere else.<sup>61</sup>

59 Smith, 'Gaius', 281.

60 Ibid., 283.

61 Smith does claim, however, that Gaius' objections have similarities to what may be found in the Rabbinic Midrash and Greco-Roman rhetoric (see Smith, 'Gaius', Appendix C). Yet Smith admits (472–3), that it is impossible to connect Gaius with any specific rhetorical school because, 'Gaius does not give a detailed discussion of the objections nor does he employ any of the technical vocabulary which the trained rhetorician would have applied in his literary and historical criticism of a literary document.'

Smith errs on at least two points here. First, the *Dialogue* was not between Gaius and Hippolytus but between Gaius and Proclus the Montanist. As such it cannot be the source of bar Salibi's record of a dispute between the pair of Roman orthodox churchmen.<sup>62</sup> Even if bar Salibi were dependent upon Hippolytus' putative refutation of Gaius, as Smith suggests elsewhere,<sup>63</sup> this does not mean that *this* work accurately reflects the form and content of the earlier work in which these criticisms purportedly arose. Secondly, and more importantly, is the fact that there is nothing markedly unique about bar Salibi's record of the form of the objections and responses by Gaius and Hippolytus at all.

So much attention has been paid to the few citations of Gaius and Hippolytus in the bar Salibi commentaries that the rest of bar Salibi's writings have been neglected. Yet there is much to be gained in examining the broader scope of these writings. In particular, it is abundantly clear that bar Salibi employs the criticism-response form *throughout* his writings.

In each of his commentaries on the Gospels, bar Salibi attributes numerous objections to 'heretics', some of whom he names, others he does not. To each of these objections he provides a rebuttal. The form of these objections and refutations bears a striking resemblance to those of Gaius and Hippolytus. For example, in his commentaries on the Synoptic Gospels, one finds additional examples of the criticisms-response form. Examples of the introductory formulae of the criticism and response are as follows:

Mt. 1:25: *Haereticus vero dicit . . . Et dicimus . . .*

Mt. 2:13: *At obiiciunt pagani . . . Et dicimus . . .*

Mt. 26:38: *Haeretici dicunt . . . Ad eos dicimus . . .*

Mt. 27:46: *Ariani dicunt . . . Nestoriani et Chacedonenses dicunt . . . Nos vero dicimus*

62 Brent, *Hippolytus*, 149. Brent notes, 'If these fragments [of Gaius' statements in bar Salibi] are summaries of a position on the *Apocalypse*, any reason for assigning them specifically to the πρὸς Πρόκλον mentioned by Eusebius is as tenuous as the supposition that that dialogue was still available in the 11th Century.'

63 Smith, 'Gaius', 197. On the one hand, Smith argues that bar Salibi never had a copy of Gaius' *Dialogue* (197), and that he derived his knowledge of Gaius' criticisms via the lost Hippolytan *Apology*, which is the same as the *Heads against Gaius* (202); yet on the other hand, Smith's later arguments seem to presume bar Salibi actually had a copy of Gaius' *Dialogue*: 'Dionysius bar Salibi and Epiphanius have provided a valuable witness to this aspect [*viz.* Gaius' criticisms] in the form and content of Gaius' *Dialogue*' (281). He explains that Hippolytus' refutation of Gaius must have preserved the original content of Gaius' *Dialogue* (204), but this is pure speculation.



ibid.: *Verumtamen quidam obiiciunt... Et dicimus...*

ibid.: *Nunc redarguamus Arianos qui dicunt... Adversus eos dicimus...*

Mk. 8:32: *Haeretici seu Ariani hoc argumentum adducunt... Adversus eos dicimus...*

Lk. 1:35: *Nestoriani dicunt... Adversus eos dicimus*

ibid.: *Rursus, haeretici dicunt... Adversus eos sic dicimus*

ibid.: *Haeretici dicunt... Adversus eos dicimus*

Lk. 2:21: *Haeretici et gentiles dicunt...*

ibid.: *Armeni, et Phantasiastae cum eis dicunt... Et dicimus...*

Lk. 2:24: *Haeretici autem dicunt... et dicimus...*

Lk. 2:40: *Haeretici dicunt... et dicimus*

Lk. 2:49: *Interroga haereticus...*

Lk. 2:51: *Haeretici dicunt... et dicimus...*

Lk. 3:23: *Haeretici dicunt... et dicimus...*

*Exp. Evangel. (Caput XXIX):*<sup>64</sup> *Obiiciunt nobis Arabes... Et dicimus...*

ibid. (*Caput XXX*): *Verum etiam Iudaei accusant nos... Et dicimus...*

This is but a sampling; there are many more examples. In fact, bar Salibi's commentaries on Scripture are not the only sources for this method of writing; this criticism-response form is also seen elsewhere. For example, his *Response to the Arabs*,<sup>65</sup> a theological treatise against Islam, is so saturated with records of criticisms by 'heretics' and responses by bar Salibi that to remove these objections and responses would leave only scraps of this text. There are also numerous examples where bar Salibi issues a rhetorical question that is not attributed to any 'heretic', and in each instance he provides his own response (*Et dicimus...*).<sup>66</sup>

This standard formulation is on par with what is found in the Gaius-Hippolytus confrontation: the 'heretics' cite an objection after which a rebuttal

64 Dionysius bar Salibi, *Expositionem Suam Quatuor Evangelistarum* in D. Loftus (trans.), *The Exposition of Dionysius Syrus* (1672), which is also provided in the recent edition of I.-B. Chabot, *CSCO Script. Syri. T. 16* (1906), 5–22.

65 See Joseph P. Amar (trans.), *Dionysius Bar Salibi, A Response to the Arabs*, *CSCO T. 239*, vol. 615 (Leuven: Peeters, 2005).

66 For examples, see esp. his *Exp. Evangel.* just before his commentary on Matthew. A few examples include: [1] *Caput V.—Adversus eos qui dicunt Deum non generare. Et dicimus...*; [2] *Caput VIII.—Quare creatus est homo. Et dicimus...*; [3] *Dubium XI.—Cum sciret Deus hominem lapsurum, quare creavit eum? Et dicimus...*; [4] *Investigatio XII.—Quare Filius incarnatus est, et non Pater vel Spiritus? Et dicimus...*; [5] *Quaestio XIV.—Quomodo dicit Scriptura: Descendit Verbum et habitavit in Virgine, et: Misit Deus Filium suum et factus est? Et dicimus...* There are many other such instances in this portion of his commentary.



is issued, typically beginning with 'In response to them we say ...' The sheer abundance of notices in bar Salibi's writings of certain objections being raised, followed by answers provided, does not strengthen the argument for the unique qualities of the supposed dispute between Gaius and Hippolytus. The primary distinction with the Gaius/Hippolytus dialogue is that bar Salibi provides individual names of the interlocutors.

Smith also makes much of the fact that Gaius pits the Johannine text against other Scripture to prove that it is uncanonical.<sup>67</sup> Gaius' criticisms, in his view, were unique in the way he used Scripture to invalidate the Johannine writings. However, this too is seen elsewhere in the writings of bar Salibi, with no indication it has derived from Gaius. In his commentary on Mt. 27:46 bar Salibi records an objection from an anonymous critic. In this instance Matthew's account of Jesus' last words on the cross is pitted against statements made in John's Gospel. Bar Salibi states, 'Nevertheless, someone objects: "How was the Son forsaken by the Father when He Himself said, 'I am in my Father and My Father is in Me' [Jn. 10:38]?"'<sup>68</sup> Just as he does elsewhere, bar Salibi provides a solution to this dilemma (without attributing it to Hippolytus). In his commentary on Lk. 2:24, another nameless heretics state that Luke's account is incompatible with other Scripture. Bar Salibi states, 'However, heretics state: "This does not fit with the Word God: 'the days were fulfilled,' (Lk. 2:6) etc., neither that 'He went up into the Temple and offered sacrifices'" (Lev. 12:8).'<sup>69</sup> Later, in his comments on Lk. 10:25, bar Salibi notes that another group of nameless people (not designated 'heretics' *per se*), suggest that Luke's account of the lawyer who put Jesus to the test does not square with Matthew's account. Here again bar Salibi has a ready answer.<sup>70</sup>

In light of these other objections of similar style, it is difficult to find agreement with Smith's view that Gaius' objections were unique in that he pitted Scripture against Scripture to disprove the reliability of one or the other citation. Rather, Gaius' criticisms correspond directly with the general form of criticism-response writing that is seen elsewhere in the bar Salibi writings, and

67 Smith, 'Gaius', 282, 286–7.

68 cSCO Script. Syri. T. 99 Versio, 108: *Veruntamen quidam obiiciunt: Quomodo Filius derelictus est a Patre cum ipse dixisset: Ego sum in Patre meo et Pater meus in me?*

69 cSCO Script. Syri. T. 61 Versio, 229: *Haeretici autem dicunt: Non convenit Verbo Deo illud: Impleti sunt dies, etc., neque illud: Ascendit in templum et obtulit sacrificia.*

70 Ibid., 269. *Quidam dicunt: Hic diversus est ab eo quem Matthaeus memorat; et patet ex eo quod hic ut tentator accessit ad eum, ille vero non ut tentator, et ex eo quod scribam illum, quem dicunt Matthaeus [Matt. 19:16] et Marcus [Mark 10:17], Lucas post hunc eventum memorat [Luke 18:18]; quod si unus esset non bis descripsisset illum.*

there is precedent elsewhere in bar Salibi's writings for objections in which Scripture is used to refute other Scripture. This also has direct bearing on Prigent's argument, for it is clear that scores of bar Salibi's statements fit this mold and thus the Gaius/Hippolytus dialogue is not strictly unique. Rather than this type of form indicating an apologetic source, the widespread use of the criticism-response formula suggests it is more likely a reflection of bar Salibi's own method of writing. In these instances, the only 'Apology' written by a church Father was from the hand of the medieval Syrian Monophysite himself. Likewise, the prevalence of this criticism-response formula scattered throughout the writings of bar Salibi casts further doubt on the authenticity of the *Heads against Gaius/Apology* recorded by Ebed-Jesu, especially if Nautin and Brent are right in arguing that he presumed the existence of such a work from having read bar Salibi's commentary. Given all of this, I find it difficult to maintain that bar Salibi indeed had an authentic text in his hands in which an actual debate between Gaius and Hippolytus of Rome was recorded.<sup>71</sup> There are two important questions that remain: (i) where did he derive the names

---

71 It is true, however, that Sebastian Brock has located a sixth-century fragment in which a certain 'Gaius' and Hippolytus appear to be in a dispute (Sebastian Brock, *Catalog of Syriac Fragments (New Finds) In the Library of the Monastery of Saint Catherine, Mount Sinai* [Athens: Mount Sinai Foundation, 1995], see 17–19 and the translation in the Appendix. For Brock (19), the fragment, 'is almost certainly to be identified with Hippolytus' lost Against Gaius,' presumably referencing Ebed-Jesu's *Heads (or Chapters) Against Gaius*. Brock notes 'several correspondences with Dionysius bar Salibi's Commentary on the Apocalypse,' but also points out at least one discrepancy with a known Hippolytan work (*de Antichristo* 49). I am unclear how Brock finds such a close connection between these two texts, for these 'correspondences' serve more to distance than connect the fragment from the work of bar Salibi. It is true that there is a broad similarity between these texts in that the 'Gaius' character does make some accusations against the clarity of the Apocalypse and its inability to comport with what is found in the Gospel of Matthew or the Psalms. However, the distinctions far outweigh any similarities. None of the criticisms in the fragment are identical to those in bar Salibi's commentary, none of them make appeals to the same precise texts, and none of the textual links Brock claims bar Salibi derived from this fragment are substantive in any way (most would easily derive from the Apocalypse itself). Most notable of all, Gaius is clearly portrayed *not* as an anti-Montanist Roman, learned and ecclesiastical man, but a Jewish critic. It is possible that bar Salibi *might* have been familiar with this text, but to claim he used it in his commentary is untenable given the available evidence. Furthermore, given Brent's argument (see above, 4.1), considering the work *Κατὰ Βήρωνος* which is part of a florilegium including Hippolytan pseudepigrapha dating back to the sixth century, the manuscript in Brock's hands may just as easily be another example of Hippolytus as a main character in a pseudonymous work (cf. Brent, *Hippolytus*, 178).

*Caius* and *Hippolytus Romanus*, and (ii) if these names were not directly lifted from a singular source, where did he get his information? To determine the answers to these questions, we begin by turning to the preface of this exegetical work.

#### 4.3.2 *Bar Salibi's Preface to His Commentary on the Apocalypse*

Perhaps the most valuable piece of evidence that emerges from bar Salibi's *Commentary on the Apocalypse* is the preface. He notes that there are many who doubt the authenticity of John's Apocalypse before appealing to the testimony of Eusebius regarding those in the early church who claimed it was not his. However, a comparison between these two accounts suggests that his read of the Father of Church History is generally representative, but not fully accurate.

---

Dionysius bar Salibi<sup>72</sup>

Eusebius

---

And Eusebius of Caesarea declares the same thing in his ecclesiastical writings.

(1.a) For Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, says that the Revelation was not that of John the Apostle, but of another John, 'the Presbyter,' who lived in Asia. The reason is, that the style of the Revelation is not like the type of the language of the Gospel. Also John makes no mention of his name at all in the Gospel, but does put his name at the beginning and end of the Revelation.

(1.b) *HE* 7.25.7–9: 'Yet I cannot admit that [the author of the Apocalypse] was the apostle, the son of Zebedee . . . who wrote the Gospel and Catholic Epistle. For from the style of both and the forms of expression, and the whole execution of the book, I judge that it is not his. For nowhere does the evangelist give his name, or mention himself in the Gospel . . . however, the author of the Apocalypse introduces himself at the very beginning.'  
Cf. *HE* 3.39.4—'John the Presbyter' (Papias)

Now we agree that he received the Revelation of which he wrote from our Lord.

---

72 Translation from Robinson, 486–7.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>(2.a) Irenaeus the bishop, and Hippolytus of Bozra say that the Revelation is that of John the Evangelist, and that it was granted about the end of the reign of Domitian.</p>  | <p>(2.b) <i>HE</i> 3.18.2–3 (cf. 5.8.5–6): 'Irenaeus ... speaks concerning John [the evangelist], '... for it (the Apocalypse) was seen not long ago ... at the end of the reign of Domitian' (cf. <i>AH</i> 5.30.3). Cf. <i>HE</i> 6.20.2: Beryllus of Bostra, Hippolytus, Gaius; <i>HE</i> 6.22.1–2: Works of Hippolytus.</p>  |
| <p>(3.a) And Eusebius of Caesarea agrees with this, but immediately says that some do not accept it as being the Revelation of John the Apostle, so saying that it is the work of John the Elder, who was a contemporary of John the Apostle. And there are two tombs in Asia, one being that of the Evangelist, the other that of John the Elder.</p> | <p>(3.b) <i>HE</i> 3.39.5–7: 'The name John is twice enumerated by him (Papias) ... the first being the one of the apostles, the other he explicitly calls a presbyter ... This shows that the statement is true that there were two tombs in Ephesus, each of which is called John's ... It was probably the second that saw the Revelation which is attributed by name to John.'</p> |
- 

It is immediately obvious from this comparison that bar Salibi has blended together various pieces of Eusebius' testimony to create a historical narrative to introduce his commentary, or he drew his information from a catena tradition on the subject of the authenticity of the Apocalypse. But how accurate is bar Salibi's account? A closer look at the way in which he has handled Eusebius' testimony will go a long way in clarifying the nature of the Hippolytus/Gaius dialogue seen in the rest of his commentary. Each of these sections provided will therefore be discussed in detail.

#### 4.3.3 *Dionysius of Alexandria on the Authorship of the Apocalypse*

Dionysius bar Salibi begins his preface with Eusebius' citation of Dionysius of Alexandria on the question of the authorship of the Apocalypse (*HE* 7.25). Bar Salibi is correct that Dionysius of Alexandria claims that John never put his name on the Gospel (or the Epistles), whereas the author of the Apocalypse does (*HE* 7.25.8–11). He also notes the differences in the style and language of the Apocalypse as compared to the Gospel and Epistle (*HE* 7.25.7–8, 17–27).

There are, however, elements that he attributes to Dionysius of Alexandria that are not found in his testimony. In particular, bar Salibi maintains that he claimed the Apocalypse was written by 'John the presbyter' who lived

in Asia. This does not appear anywhere in Eusebius' record of Dionysius of Alexandria's account. Rather, Dionysius of Alexandria's testimony alludes to the two 'monuments' in Asia each bearing the name John. This other 'John' is identified by Papias and Eusebius as 'John the Presbyter' in *HE* 3.39.4–5, where these two tombs are mentioned. It may be a fair inference to claim Dionysius of Alexandria meant 'John the Presbyter' given that he appears to allude to the Papias tradition, but the fact remains that bar Salibi has blended together different testimonies recorded in Eusebius.

#### 4.3.4 *Irenaeus and 'Hippolytus of Bozra' on the Authorship of the Apocalypse*

In this second section bar Salibi has combined the testimony of Irenaeus with that of a person named 'Hippolytus of Bozra'. His statements about Irenaeus are verifiable, however his notice of this other Hippolytus is very strange, for the earliest evidence does not speak of the existence of any such person.

The most obvious solution to the question of this unknown Hippolytus is that it is due to a garbled interpretation of Eusebius (*HE* 6.20.2). Here, Eusebius praises the writings of 'very learned men of the time' whose letters to each other were preserved at Aelia. After familiarizing himself with works from this library Eusebius notes Beryllus, who was bishop of Bostra in Arabia, followed immediately by Hippolytus 'who presided over another church', followed by Gaius, who disputed with Proclus (*HE* 6.20.1–3).

Interestingly, Rufinus' Latin translation<sup>73</sup> confuses this passage in such a way that Hippolytus could easily be seen as from Bostra as well, yet bar Salibi would not have had Rufinus' work in his hands. Thus, either bar Salibi drew his information from an earlier, erroneous translation, or directly from his own reading of Eusebius in which case he would be responsible for this mistaken reading. However, he would certainly not be the first.<sup>74</sup> At the end of the fifth century, Gelasius mentions a certain '*Hippolyti episcopi et Martyris Arabum metropolis in memoria haeresium*'.<sup>75</sup> Allen Brent also points to Jerome (*Chronicon* 11,

73 Rufinus' translation (GCS Band 6,2): *Erat inter caeteros et Beryllus scriptorum praecipuus, qui et ipse diversa opuscula dereliquit. Episcopus fuit hic apud Bostram, Arabiae urbem maximam. Erat nihilominus et Hippolytus, qui et ipse aliquanta scripta dereliquit, episcopus.*

74 J.J. Döllinger *Hippolytus and Callistus; or, The Church of Rome in the First Half of the Third Century*. Trans. Alfred Plummer (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1876), 83. See also Cerrato, 74–5, who notes that as far back as the seventeenth century Jean-Baptiste Cotelier argued that 'Hippolytus Bostra' was the product of a misreading of Eusebius. Cf. Jean-Baptiste Cotelier, *Ecclesiae graecae monumenta*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1677–86), vol. II (1681), 639–40.

75 See Paul Lagarde, *Hippolyti Romani Quae Feruntur Omnia Graece* (Leipzig: B.G. Teubneri), 90–1.

Ann. Abr. 2244, Alexandr. 6), who records, '*Geminus presbyter Antiochenus et Hippolytus et Beryllus episcopus Arabiae Bostrenus clari scriptores habentur*.'<sup>76</sup> There are also numerous written works that are attributed to 'Hippolytus of Bostra'. G. Garitte notes that out of the twenty-one Armenian manuscripts in the catalogue of Yerevan that are attributed to Hippolytus, fourteen explicitly refer to him by the name '*Hipolit Bostrac*'i.<sup>77</sup> Some of these writings attributed to 'Hippolytus of Bostra' are undoubtedly from Hippolytus of Rome.<sup>78</sup> L.-M. Froidevaux notes that 'Hippolytus of Bostra' is cited as the author of the portion entitled 'Questions and Answers' in the lemma of the seventh century Armenian florilegium entitled *Seal of the Faith*.<sup>79</sup>

It is possible that there was an historical person with this name. Froidevaux, for example, has argued that portions of this Armenian florilegium attributed to 'Hippolytus of Bostra', is actually a pre-Nicene work from this other Hippolytus. Froidevaux goes so far as to reconstruct his hypothetical life. However, it is worth noting that Eusebius demonstrates no knowledge of such a person. Neither Eusebius nor Jerome claim to know where Hippolytus' See actually was. And since bar Salibi himself claims to have derived his information from Eusebius, either he has misread Eusebius' testimony or he derived it from a later source that has already confused the location of Beryllus of Bostra with Hippolytus' indeterminate See. In either case, it is important to note that bar Salibi's notice of *Hippolytus Bosrae* is distinguished from the *Hippolytus Romanus* in the following confrontation with Gaius.

Finally, if bar Salibi is using Eusebius' work as his only source, as he claims, he has again blended portions of his testimony that are derived from different portions of this work. Eusebius never mentions Irenaeus and Hippolytus together, nor does he mention Hippolytus' views on the Apocalypse or any Hippolytan work on the subject.

#### 4.3.5 *Dionysius Bar Salibi, Eusebius, and Papias on the Authorship of the Apocalypse*

Bar Salibi claims that Eusebius agrees with the testimonies of Irenaeus and *Hippolytus Bosrae*. It is true that Eusebius cites Irenaeus' testimony of the dating of the Apocalypse twice (*HE* 3.18.2–3; 5.8.5–6), but only in the first instance

<sup>76</sup> Brent, *Hippolytus*, 149.

<sup>77</sup> Gérard Garitte, 'Une nouvelle source du « De fide » géorgien attribué à Hippolyte,' *Revue D'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 43 (1968): 835–43, 842, n. 3.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, 842.

<sup>79</sup> '*Hippolyti episcopi Bostrenorum, in sanctam Trinitatem, quaestio et responsum*.' See L.-M. Froidevaux, 'Les Questions et Réponses sur la sainte Trinité attribuées à Hippolyte, évêque de Bostra,' *Recherches de science religieuse* 50 (1962): 32–73, 49–54; cf. also Garitte, 836.

does he affirm Irenaeus' testimony. And it is clear in this passage that he only agrees with the dating of the Apocalypse as from the time of Domitian, for it is in this introduction of Irenaeus' statement that he adds the 'the *so-called* Apocalypse of John'.

Bar Salibi also confuses Eusebius' account of Papias (*HE* 3.39). He is wholly unaware that the argument for 'John the Presbyter' as the author of the Apocalypse originated from *Eusebius himself*, who took his cue from Papias, and in all likelihood was influenced by the testimony of Dionysius of Alexandria (*HE* 7.25.7ff.). Bar Salibi, however, implies that Eusebius is merely recording the views of others.

#### 4.3.6 *Analysis of the Historicity of the Preface*

Returning to the preface as a whole, what is one to make of bar Salibi's account of Eusebius? If bar Salibi only used Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica* as his source, then he has clearly amalgamated a number of different passages into his preface. He is certainly aware of the major issues surrounding John's Apocalypse. The question of which 'John' wrote it is not lost on bar Salibi, nor is the fact that there are two tombs in Asia that bear this name—an appeal made both by Eusebius and Dionysius of Alexandria in their attempt to explain (away) the author of the Apocalypse as someone other than John the Apostle. Yet there is also a demonstrable lack of precision to his testimony. He claims to have derived knowledge of a certain *Hippolytus Bosrae* from Eusebius, who himself never mentions any such person. He puts words in the mouth of Dionysius of Alexandria that he never uttered. Also, he totally exonerates Eusebius from having any qualms over who authored the Apocalypse. Bar Salibi makes Eusebius out to be in agreement with Irenaeus and *Hippolytus Bosrae*, when it is clear Eusebius himself manipulated Irenaeus' words to cast doubt on the 'so-called' Apocalypse, and he expresses his own doubts as to its apostolic authorship.

#### 4.3.7 *Analysis of the Gaius/Hippolytus Dispute in the Preface*

After his historical introduction, bar Salibi immediately begins to cite Hippolytus *of Rome* and his description of the opponent of the Apocalypse, Gaius. It is curious that it is not until this section that bar Salibi demonstrates his knowledge of another critical issue: whether or not Cerinthus was the author of the Apocalypse (and the Gospel) of John.<sup>80</sup> He would have been aware of this issue from the passages he has already noted. Dionysius of Alexandria makes explicit reference to the question of Cerinthus and the

80 Cf. Brent, *Hippolytus*, 146.



Apocalypse, but nothing of John's Gospel. Epiphanius, however, does link the two, and it is interesting that elsewhere in his commentaries, bar Salibi demonstrates that he is also familiar with the testimony of this Church Father.<sup>81</sup> The question is whether bar Salibi has derived his information from a singular source, or blended information from various sources as he has done in the first part of his preface.

Smith argues that bar Salibi's notice of Hippolytus as the narrator proves that his source was from this Church Father. But if this is indeed the case, as Brent notes it is bizarre that Hippolytus would have referred to himself as *Hippolytus Romanus* and would have been found 'quoting himself in saintly proportions' as *beatus Hippolytus*.<sup>82</sup> Brent suggests bar Salibi has emerged on the back end of a long literary legend concerning issues surrounding the Johannine literature that ultimately derives from Epiphanius' notice of the *Alogi*. Thus, bar Salibi himself is responsible for the creation of this exchange between Hippolytus and Gaius based on a general hermeneutical tradition concerning John's Apocalypse.

This is possible, if not likely, especially in light of the Hippolytan pseudepigrapha that Brent notes; but I believe another, perhaps more likely scenario is that bar Salibi has surmised Gaius' opposition to the Apocalypse from a misreading of Eusebius. In *HE* 3.28.1–2 Eusebius only notes that Gaius, 'in his dispute', wrote against Cerinthus' carnal chiliasm that he claims in his own apocalyptic work. Immediately afterwards, Eusebius provides a shortened form of Dionysius of Alexandria's statements, of which bar Salibi was well aware.<sup>83</sup> It is also interesting that Eusebius, in transitioning from Gaius' statements to those of Dionysius, states, 'And Dionysius [in his work *On the Promises*]... mentions the same man' (*HE* 3.28.3). A careless reading could conclude that Eusebius means Gaius, not Cerinthus. One wonders whether bar Salibi has interpreted Eusebius' statements along the same lines as what is evident throughout the past century of scholarship, which sees the placement of Gaius' statements juxtaposed with those of Dionysius of Alexandria and concludes that Gaius must be the one who maintained these views.

81 He notes Epiphanius in his statements on Matt. 27:5, in A. Vaschalde (ed.), *Dionysii bar Salibi: Commentarii in Evangelia* II (1). Versio. *cSCO Scriptores Syri Series Secunda*, Tomus XCIX (Leuven, 1933), 82. Also, his statements on Lk. 22:15, in *ibid.* II (2), p. 319.

82 Brent, *Hippolytus*, 176.

83 In his preface, bar Salibi cites Hippolytus as stating that Cerinthus taught carnal eating and drinking and many other blasphemies. This is identical information to what is found in Dionysius of Alexandria, and very similar to what is noted by Gaius of Rome (*HE* 3.28.1–5). Cf. Smith, 'Gaius', 197.



From here bar Salibi, encouraged by Eusebius' note that Gaius was involved in a dispute on this subject, could have simply supplied the name Gaius as the antagonist in the standard criticism-response formula that he uses freely elsewhere.

It is peculiar that bar Salibi never mentioned the name 'Gaius' in his earlier historical introduction, for Gaius clearly spoke out about Cerinthus and his *Apocalypse*. If he understood Gaius' criticism of the Cerinthian *Apocalypse* in *HE* 3.28 as *not* bearing any reference to John's Apocalypse, then this would have provided bar Salibi with an excellent 'learned' defense against the views mentioned by Dionysius of Alexandria. He could have pointed to Gaius as an 'orthodox' and 'ecclesiastical' man who notes that Cerinthus pseudonymously composed *his own* apocalyptic work under the guise of 'a great apostle'. But bar Salibi makes no such appeal to Gaius as an 'orthodox' respondent to this accusation. This leaves two possibilities: either (i) bar Salibi is wholly unaware of Gaius' statements regarding Cerinthus and a certain apocalyptic work, or (ii) he has wrongly interpreted Gaius' statements.

The first is unlikely given that bar Salibi is drawing on Eusebian texts wherein Gaius is featured. The second possibility provides the better way forward. It is important to note that in Eusebius' notice of Gaius and the Cerinthian *Apocalypse*, no mention is made of Gaius as an 'ecclesiastical' or 'learned' man, nor is there any hint that he was to be admired for his fight against the Montanists, that he wrote his comments about Cerinthus to refute the Montanist Proclus, or that he was located in Rome. Only in this passage (*HE* 3.28.1–2) is Gaius divorced from all defining factors that are present elsewhere: he is simply quoted for his views against Cerinthus' *Apocalypse*. From this passage alone, Gaius could easily be misunderstood as the spokesman for the view that Cerinthus was the true author of the Apocalypse. In this case, bar Salibi has his orthodox hero, Hippolytus, who, as Prigent notes, is a major source for him throughout his *Commentary on the Apocalypse*. He also has the despicable enemy, 'Gaius', whose perceived opinions against John's Apocalypse and role in a dispute on this subject may well have earned him the antagonist position in the standard criticism-response formulae that is prevalent throughout bar Salibi's writings.

There is good reason, therefore, to suggest that bar Salibi has created this exchange from a source or a catena that was available to him and simply supplied the names Gaius and Hippolytus. It is reasonable to object, however, that bar Salibi claims in his preface to have derived this information from Hippolytus. Yet the veracity of bar Salibi's citation of Hippolytus is not free from questions. This may be seen in the way bar Salibi cites Hippolytus (and other early Church Fathers).

#### 4.4 Discrepancies between bar Salibi and the Early Sources

There are significant differences in the way bar Salibi cites Hippolytus in contrast to those statements in the extant Hippolytan literature. The following examples do not bolster confidence that all the information bar Salibi claims to have derived from Hippolytus actually does.

1. Gwynn originally noted a disagreement between the way in which bar Salibi portrayed Hippolytus' response to Gaius' final objection on the binding of Satan (Rev. 20:2–3) versus the binding of 'the strong man' (cf. Mt. 12:29), and that of Hippolytus' views in *Dan.* 4.33.4–5. In the latter passage, Satan has *already* been bound; in bar Salibi's notice, Hippolytus asks mockingly, 'If the Devil has been bound, how does he deceive the faithful and persecute and plunder men?'<sup>84</sup> Indeed, there are more similarities between Gaius' views as recorded by bar Salibi and those of Hippolytus in *Dan.* 4.33.4–5 than between Hippolytus' statements in *Dan.* and those in bar Salibi.

2. Hill has also noted disagreement on the portrayals of Hippolytus' eschatological views. In contrast to the chiliastic views that bar Salibi attributes to Hippolytus in his response to the same objection of Gaius, Hill has argued that a close reading of *Ant.* 61, 65 (cf. *Dan.* 4.11.4) shows that he did *not* actually maintain such chiliastic notions, but rather opposed them.<sup>85</sup> Moreover, Hill demonstrates that Hippolytus' view of the millennium in Rev. 20—the very chapter against which Gaius objects—actually refers to the present age.<sup>86</sup> This does not square with bar Salibi's portrayal of Hippolytus.

3. Allen Brent has made two arguments that the supposed dialogue between Hippolytus and Gaius demonstrates more contradictions than similarities between bar Salibi's record of Hippolytus and features of *Dan.* and *Ant.*<sup>87</sup> First, bar Salibi cites Hippolytus as equating the *pollutionem desolationis* with the Antichrist,<sup>88</sup> but he claims for himself the interpretation that it is the little horn of Daniel 7:8, 20–21 that is the Antichrist. In fact, Brent shows that bar Salibi's own words are actually those of Hippolytus in *Ant.* 28 and 47. Not only has bar Salibi attributed to Hippolytus an interpretation that was not his own,

84 *Comm. Apoc.* 19 (Rev. 20:2): *Hippolytus refutat eum et dicit: Si est victus impostor, quomodo decipiat fideles et persequitur spoliisque homines?* Here I cite the English translation of Gwynn, 403.

85 C.E. Hill, *Regnum Caelorum: Patterns of Millennial Thought in Early Christianity*. 2nd Ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 160–5.

86 *Ibid.*, 167.

87 Brent, *Hippolytus*, 179–80.

88 *Comm. Apoc.* 12 (Rev. 11:2).

but he claimed what Hippolytus *did* say for himself. Second, Brent also argues that it is ‘extremely suspicious’ that the Logos Christology, which is a distinctive feature of Hippolytus’ *Dan.* and *Ant.*, is nowhere to be found in bar Salibi’s dialogue between Hippolytus and Gaius.<sup>89</sup>

To these points I add the following:

4. In his preface, bar Salibi cites Hippolytus’ views of Cerinthus that are not found in the extant Hippolytan corpus:

This Cerinthus was one who taught circumcision, and was angry with Paul when he did not circumcise Titus, and the Apostle calls him and his disciples in one of his letters ‘sham apostles, crafty workers.’ Again he teaches that the world was created by angels, and that our Lord was not born of a virgin. He also teaches carnal eating and drinking, and many other blasphemies. The Gospel and Revelation of John, however, are like the teaching which the Scriptures contain; and so they are liars who say that the Revelation is not by the Apostle John.<sup>90</sup>

It is true that in his *Refutatio* (7.22; 10.21) Hippolytus notes that Cerinthus did not believe in the Virgin birth, rather he held adoptionistic views of Jesus and that the world was created by an angelic power. These are also noted by Irenaeus (*AH* 1.26.1), to whom Hippolytus was indebted for much of his information, with the exception that an angel was responsible for creation—that is uniquely Hippolytan.<sup>91</sup> However, this is all that connects this statement from bar Salibi with known Hippolytan works.

Regarding the ‘eating and drinking’ and other blasphemies, this has direct correlation with what bar Salibi has already recorded from the testimony of Dionysius of Alexandria’s testimony in Eusebius (*HE* 3.28.5; 7.25.3). It is important to note that Gaius is *not* recorded as making this accusation (*HE* 3.28.1–2). Gaius’ description of the Cerinthian millennium is painted with broader strokes. He notes only that the flesh will be subject to desires and pleasures.

Also, the fact that bar Salibi cites Hippolytus as criticizing Cerinthus’ views of Paul and circumcision caused Klijn and Reinink to conclude that bar Salibi did not derive this from an authentic Hippolytan work. Rather, they note that, ‘These are ideas concerning Cerinthus that cannot be found earlier than

89 Brent, *Hippolytus*, 180–2.

90 English translation in Robinson, 487; Latin translation in *Comm. Apoc.* 1–2.

91 Ps.-Tertullian makes the same claim (*Adv. omn. haer.* 3). See Klijn and Reinink, 4. Irenaeus (*AH* 1.26) only refers to Cerinthus’ belief that a ‘Power’ created the world.

in Epiphanius.<sup>92</sup> It is true that nowhere in Hippolytus' *Refutatio* or in Ps.-Tertullian's work is there any mention of Cerinthus' views on circumcision or Paul. Irenaeus mentions similar views concerning the Ebionites, whom he links with Cerinthus on account of their erroneous christology, but not in praxis (*AH* 1.26.2). Epiphanius, however, is more explicit in his account. He is the first to read Cerinthus and his followers into Paul's second Epistle to the Corinthians (11:13), where Paul calls them 'false prophets and deceitful workers' (*Haer.* 28.4.6). This is *precisely* what bar Salibi records. What about the notice of Cerinthus' disillusionment that Paul did not circumcise Titus? No mention of this is made by Hippolytus or Irenaeus, but again Epiphanius provides this information in *Haer* 28.4.1–2, where he has read Cerinthus into the account in Galatians 2:3–5. As Klijn and Reinink suggest, Epiphanius may have been influenced by the tradition recorded in the *Epistula Apostolorum*, which lists Cerinthus as one of the 'pseudo-apostles'. From this notice, Epiphanius may have linked Cerinthus as one of the ψευδαπόστολοι mentioned by Paul in 11 Cor. 11:13 (and the ψευδαδελφοὺς of Gal. 2:4).<sup>93</sup>

Bar Salibi clearly cites information that he claims to have originated from Hippolytus. Some of this information does come from Hippolytus, but much of it also comes from Dionysius of Alexandria by way of Eusebius, as well as Epiphanius' account of Cerinthus.

5. In his exposition on Lk. 18:8, bar Salibi cites Hippolytus as referring to the Antichrist as the unjust judge, and the widow as the synagogue of the Jews. In *Ant.* 57 Hippolytus does connect the unrighteous judge with the Antichrist, however the widow is not the Synagogue but Jerusalem.

There are also various other instances, not involving Hippolytus, where bar Salibi claims to derive information from early sources. In at least two places there is an apparent disjunction between what bar Salibi records and what the earlier sources actually said. To demonstrate this, consider his exposition on Mt. 27:5, where bar Salibi cites from Papias, followed immediately by Epiphanius. Of Papias, he records: 'Papias states that [Judas'] male organs were swollen, and that putrid substance, vile stench and maggots came out of them.'<sup>94</sup> The only extant Papian fragment that resembles this comes from Apollinaris of Laodicea in the fourth century, who records that 'His genitals appeared more loathsome and larger than anyone else's, and when he relieved

92 Klijn and Reinink, 6.

93 Ibid., 10.

94 'Et Papias dicit: Etiam membra eius virilia intumuerunt, et putredo et foetor cum verminibus manabant de eis.' *CSCO* tom. 49, vols. 98, 82.

himself there passed through it pus and worms from every part of his body.<sup>95</sup> J. Rendell Harris, who is to be remembered for adamantly holding that bar Salibi intended Gaius as the spokesman for the otherwise anonymous criticism against John, claims here that the Syrian Father has derived this citation after manipulating the catena that does not go back to Papias himself, but to Apollinaris.<sup>96</sup> The difficulties surrounding the textual tradition of Papias are too numerous to know definitively whether bar Salibi's information is fully accurate, but the very next line suggests the verdict is negative.

Immediately following this, bar Salibi cites Epiphanius on Judas' death. 'Epiphanius says, [Judas] lived forty days after the crucifixion and was split apart in the middle, and all of his internal organs were poured out.'<sup>97</sup> Yet nowhere does Epiphanius actually make the claim that Judas lived for forty days after the crucifixion, or that Judas' death was solely by disembowelment. One would expect to find such statements in his refutation of the Cainites, throughout which he associates Cain and Judas. In *Haer.* 38.8.3, Epiphanius actually conflates the account of Judas' death in a field (*via* disembowelment) as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles (1:18) with Matthew's account (27:5) that Judas hanged himself. He does not say this occurred forty days after Jesus' death, however.

This by no means implies that bar Salibi is totally unreliable in his recounting of the events of the early church. Yet it *must* be recognized that his citations of his predecessors should not be taken at face value. In those instances where bar Salibi's information is demonstrably inaccurate, either he has simply misread the earliest sources themselves, or, as Brent notes, he may stand at the end of a tradition that has provided bar Salibi with mangled versions of the evidence. In this case, bar Salibi is likely reliant upon a garbled catena in which topics such as the death of Judas, the Antichrist, and the opposition to the Apocalypse have been associated with the writings of the earliest Fathers, sometimes accurately, and other times inaccurately.

95 English translation in Michael Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations* (Grand Rapids: Baker Press, 1999), 583, 585. The text from Apollinaris is reconstructed from various fragments. C. Preuschen, *Antilegomena*, 2nd ed. (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1905), 97–99.

96 J. Rendell Harris, 'Did Judas Really Commit Suicide?' *AJT* 4, n. 3 (Jul. 1900), 507.

97 *cscO* tom. 49, vols. 98, 82–3: Epiphanius dicit: « Vixit post crucifixionem quadraginta diebus, et disruptus est per medium et diffusa sunt omnia viscera eius ».

#### 4.5 The Manufactured Dialogue between Gaius and Hippolytus

Is it reasonable to presume the historicity of this dialogue between Hippolytus and Gaius, or is this narrative a figment of bar Salibi's historical misunderstanding in conjunction with his standard criticism-response formulation that he uses to drive his writings forward? Hippolytus' influence on bar Salibi's *Commentary on the Apocalypse* is certifiable, however it is curious that this is seen predominantly in those sections where no direct reference to Hippolytus is made. In contrast, when bar Salibi does claim to cite Hippolytus, there are various instances when the content of what the former puts in the mouth of the latter does not square with the positions held by Hippolytus in his extant writings. Other times Hippolytus appears to be the spokesman for multiple parties, as in the preface where Hippolytus is cited with words that belong partly to himself, partly to Dionysius of Alexandria and partly to Epiphanius. Thus, it is rash to maintain that just because bar Salibi introduces a dialogue with the phrase '*Hippolytus Romanus dixit*', what follows must therefore have actually been uttered by the speaker. It appears bar Salibi molds the words of the speakers in his narrative to say what he wants them to say.

Just as the criticism-response form is a notable feature throughout bar Salibi's commentaries on the Gospels and in his refutation of the Arabs, his *Commentary on the Apocalypse* is no exception. The primary difference between this latter work and the others is that the otherwise anonymous interlocutors are given identities. Did bar Salibi simply give names to these participants based on what he found in the writings of Eusebius? Brent thinks that bar Salibi already had a text in front of him in which the figures 'Gaius' and 'Hippolytus' were in dispute with one another.<sup>98</sup> This is possible, but it is more likely that bar Salibi has read Gaius' statements concerning Cerinthus and his *Apocalypse* in Eusebius and presumed him to lie behind the testimonies of Dionysius of Alexandria and Epiphanius. It is not difficult to see how bar Salibi could have presumed, based upon his reading of Eusebius (*HE* 3.28.1–2), that 'Gaius'—deprived of any other identifying remarks—was involved in a dispute on the subject of an 'Apocalypse' by Cerinthus who pretended it was by 'a great apostle'. Armed with his Hippolytan florilegium that clearly maintained an opposing view, the Syrian Monophysite may well have provided the names 'Gaius' and 'Hippolytus' as the identities of the parties for his criticism-response form. The form of the Gaius/Hippolytus dialogue is consistent with what is found elsewhere in bar Salibi's writings, thus there is nothing demonstrably unique about this supposed dispute. And, since the criticism-response

<sup>98</sup> Brent, *Hippolytus*, 175. Cf. also the present work, p. 102, n. 71.

form is not found anywhere else in his *Commentary on the Apocalypse* outside of the statements of Gaius and Hippolytus, it is certainly possible that this dispute represents nothing more than bar Salibi's insertion of what he perceived to be a known critic of the Apocalypse and a venerated church Father as the identities of this fictitious dialogue.

Thus, there are elements of Brent's conclusion with which I agree, and others that need modification. First, it is apparent that Brent is correct that bar Salibi used 'Hippolytus' as a cipher for the orthodox representative of the apostolic age, though bar Salibi clearly conceives of him as a unique individual. Even here, however, Hippolytus is not free from acquiring other 'orthodox' statements from Fathers such as Epiphanius or Dionysius of Alexandria. In contrast to Brent, Gaius is not merely a heterodox 'everyman'.<sup>99</sup> This is not a name that is divorced from what bar Salibi perceived to be a very real antagonist of the Apocalypse. As noted earlier, if bar Salibi wanted the objections to represent a broad, heretical antagonism to the Apocalypse, he could have simply used the less precise term *haereticus*, as he does in many other places, to accomplish this task. But Gaius is specifically named, and from reading Eusebius, or the catena rooted in Eusebius' testimony, bar Salibi has clearly conceived of Gaius as the nucleus of anti-Johannine sentiments. This was to be confirmed by the references to anonymous antagonists mentioned by Dionysius of Alexandria and Epiphanius, whose testimonies are clearly used by bar Salibi intermittently. Thus, it is clear that bar Salibi himself deduced that Gaius is the lone referent in each of these cases, but this conclusion is his own inferential leap, not a documented reality. Moreover, unless and until further studies draw a clear link between bar Salibi and the fragment published by S. Brock, noted above, I find it unlikely that bar Salibi's source(s) contained such a pseudepigraphic dialogue between these two figures. If this *were* the case, such a dispute would be more widely evidenced, and given bar Salibi's propensity towards manufactured disputes throughout his writings, I maintain the origins of this dialogue likely come from bar Salibi.

It should also be noted that *if* Gaius of Rome had made *actual* objections to the Apocalypse, especially if he argued Cerinthus was its true author as bar Salibi claims, it would be fair to presume that some of these criticisms would pertain to these concerns. But upon reading bar Salibi's commentary on Rev. 20–21, nothing is even remotely hinted concerning Cerinthus' chiliastic views. Also, bar Salibi's *Caius* never records anything about Cerinthus' authorship

99 Cf. Brent, *Hippolytus*, 177–8. Although I would support his more tentative statement, 'Even if the character of Gaius as 'everyman' takes on in Barsalibi's mind a modicum of historical colouring for that dramatic presentation, that colouring is hardly very accurate.'



of this work or anything about an earthly Jerusalem, sensual pleasures or marriage feasts. It is therefore clear that the *Caius* of the historical introduction and '*Caius*' the antagonist are not linked except for bar Salibi's view of him as an opponent of the Apocalypse. Thus without any evidence of actual criticisms by this '*Caius*', he too has been attributed with statements that he never made. Some, but not all of these derive from Epiphanius' account of the *Alogi*. Others have come from sources that are simply unknown.

#### 4.6 Epiphanius and bar Salibi

Bar Salibi's '*Caius*' is not identical to the *Alogi* of Epiphanius. It is true that in some instances Gaius' criticisms appear to derive from Epiphanius' account of the *Alogi*, but the correlation between these testimonies is found only in two instances out of the five objections recorded by the *Alogi* against the Johannine literature and the six criticisms noted by bar Salibi against the same corpus. Even here, one of the two instances of overlap—concerning the Gospel of John—carries the difficulty of the absence of Gaius' name in much of the manuscript tradition. If Gaius were the true identity of the *Alogi*, and indeed if bar Salibi and Epiphanius were dependent upon the same, shared source, there would be more compatibility than what actually exists. Given the traces of Epiphanius' testimony that are woven throughout bar Salibi's account, either the Syrian commentator has compared what he has understood to be Gaius' attribution of the Apocalypse to Cerinthus with Epiphanius' description of the *Alogi* and made the link himself, or the catena tradition from which bar Salibi drew his information had juxtaposed portions of these testimonies.

##### 4.6.1 *Gaius and the Alogi on the Gospel of John*

This, then, explains the overlap in the criticisms between Epiphanius and bar Salibi. Regarding the criticism against John's Gospel, this did not come from Gaius. As Gwynn noted from the beginning, it is unlikely Gaius rejected John's Gospel because it is used by Hippolytus at least once in their supposed argument 'as an authority admitted by his opponent.'<sup>100</sup> Moreover, as Brent notes in light of the dubious manuscript tradition, bar Salibi 'cannot have made reference to a work on the *Apocalypse* that included a defence of the Fourth Gospel since he has no citations of Gaius on the Gospel itself.'<sup>101</sup> Interestingly, Lorenz Schlimme has found that bar Salibi's *Commentary on John* derives from Moses

<sup>100</sup> Gwynn, 406.

<sup>101</sup> Brent, *Hippolytus*, 171.



bar Kepha 'almost exclusively'.<sup>102</sup> Further studies along these lines may produce even more definitive results and perhaps provide further clarity as to bar Salibi's sources.

Given the fact that Gaius' name is inserted into the bar Salibi *Commentary on John* by a later editor, it is fair to conclude (i) that bar Salibi never mentioned Gaius' name in connection with this criticism, and (ii) that the editor, upon reading the preface to bar Salibi's *Commentary on the Apocalypse*, wrote in the name Gaius by way of clarification.

The fact remains that the only explicit statement that indicated Gaius rejected John's Gospel is in the preface to this later commentary. But it has been shown that this historical prelude is an assortment of various testimonies that bar Salibi has amalgamated together, and that some of his records of earlier Fathers miss the mark of accuracy. Also, as I have argued in the previous chapter, there is no early evidence to suggest Gaius rejected either the Gospel or Apocalypse of John.

For his part, Smith also has his own reservations about the integrity of the information relayed in the preface. He maintains,

With regard to the Fourth Gospel there is absolutely no evidence to support the summary statements reproduced by Epiphanius and Dionysius bar Salibi. These summary statements have too often provided the point of departure for the studies and arguments of modern scholars and have shaped the interpretations of the only statement of Gaius about Cerinthus which Eusebius preserves from the *Dialogue with Proclus* (*E.H.* III, 28, 1–2) who had direct access to the *Dialogue* in the library at Aelia.<sup>103</sup>

Smith argues that Gaius never attributed either Johannine work to Cerinthus, maintaining that bar Salibi's notice that Gaius attributed both Johannine works to Cerinthus was 'suspect'.<sup>104</sup> Thus, according to Smith, Gaius never uttered these words; rather it was Hippolytus who anchored his criticism of Gaius with the inflammatory reference to the arch-heretic Cerinthus as a means of discrediting his opponent. 'Since the summary statements themselves are dependent on Hippolytus, perhaps the suspicion should more appropriately

---

102 Lorenz Schlimme, 'Die Bibelkommentare des Moses bar Kepha,' in *A Tribute to Arthur Vööbus, Studies in Early Christian Literature and its Environment, Primarily in the Syrian East*. Ed. Robert H. Fischer (Chicago: Lutheran School of Theology, 1977), 68.

103 Smith, 'Gaius', 327.

104 Smith, 'Gaius', 170.

be cast in his direction.<sup>105</sup> If bar Salibi's record of Hippolytus' descriptions of Cerinthus were authentic, this may be plausible, but the fact remains that much of this information comes from Epiphanius.

#### 4.6.2 *Gaius and the Alogi on the Apocalypse*

In terms of the clearest link between bar Salibi and Epiphanius, it is true that the fourth objection of Gaius is similar to the final objection recorded by the *Alogi*. Both are concerned with the loosing of the angels that are on the Euphrates in Rev. 9:14–17. Harris juxtaposed these two texts in an effort to show that their similarities are 'so striking that it betrays a common origin, and this must be the work of Hippolytus, which has been rehandled by Epiphanius, and which appears, perhaps in an abbreviated form, in the extracts of Bar-Salibi.'<sup>106</sup> It is also true that both Epiphanius and bar Salibi's Hippolytus appeal to Deut. 32:7–9 for their rebuttal to this argument, but beyond that there are more differences than similarities.

Gaius is concerned that this passage does not square with Matthew's notice that 'nation shall rise up against nation' (24:7). Epiphanius' testimony, in contrast, makes no mention of this Matthean reference at all (cf. *Haer.* 51.34.2–7). Indeed, this is the only objection where there is no *explicit* criticism on the part of the *Alogi*. In each of the other objections, a Johannine passage is confronted with a specific objection, either because it does not cohere with other Scripture (*viz.* the objections to the Gospel) or because it is internally incoherent (*viz.* the first two objections to the Apocalypse). In this last objection, however, Epiphanius only cites that the *Alogi* 'get excited' (ἐπαίρονται) about this passage and think it is 'laughable' (γελοῖόν). No specific objection is raised, but in light of Epiphanius' response, it appears that the *Alogi* find humor in their misunderstanding of the meaning of the four angels sitting on the Euphrates (cf. *Haer.* 51.34.3–4). Gaius, however, offers the explicit concern that it does not cohere with Matthew's similar account.

However, the rebuttals in Epiphanius and bar Salibi may share an appeal to Deuteronomy to refute these objections, but there are also dissimilarities that are often overlooked. Brent has rightly noted that Epiphanius' aim is to prove that the angels must be released in order to command the nations that are subject to them into war (*Haer.* 51.34.6–7), whereas bar Salibi's Hippolytus does not conceive of the nations being 'subjected' to the angels in the same way.<sup>107</sup> For Epiphanius, the angels are eager to send the nations to war, but must wait for

105 Ibid., 325.

106 Harris, 52–3.

107 Brent, *Hippolytus*, 162–3.

the end of God's longsuffering. For bar Salibi's Hippolytus, the nations themselves are eager for battle. Epiphanius aligns the four angels with the four kingdoms in that area during the time of Daniel (Assyrians, Babylonians, Medes and Persians). Hippolytus, according to bar Salibi, makes no such appeal. He does, however, say that, when that day of the Lord does finally come, that is the time of the Antichrist. In contrast, Epiphanius makes no mention of the Antichrist at all. Thus, even though the issues addressed in each source share similarities of Scriptural references (Rev. 9:14–17; Deut. 32:7–9), it is not the case that the same criticism and response are given in both cases. Naturally, both make an appeal to the same passage in Deuteronomy, but with differing exegetical conclusions.<sup>108</sup>

### Summary

The evidence from Dionysius bar Salibi and Ebed-Jesu only serves to cloud the discussion with unwarranted and unfounded speculations about the nature of the *Alogi*. The links between these sources and the questions concerning a 'Johannine Controversy' have been forged together by means of assuming a number of points that are far from certain. When compared with the early evidence, both bar Salibi and Ebed-Jesu show a demonstrable lack of coherence with the history and writings of the era in which the *Alogi* purportedly existed. Likewise, the supposed 'dispute' between 'Gaius' and Hippolytus appears to be nothing more than a manufactured dialogue to serve the stylistic purposes of bar Salibi's writings. It is therefore necessary to abandon the well-worn methodological starting point that presumes bar Salibi and Ebed-Jesu are writing with privileged historical knowledge that deserves to be taken at face value. In its place, the appropriate starting point for any inquiry into the *Alogi* must begin with Epiphanius himself and the fifty-first entry of the *Panarion*. Such is the task of the following two sections of this work.

---

108 Cf. *ibid.*



## SECTION 2

### *Epiphanius and the Alogi in Context*





## Epiphanius: History and Heresy

Having dismantled the common methodological approach to the question of the *Alogi* in the previous section, it is time to rebuild. The key evidence is not to be found in a statue, later sources, or the assumed contents of works that no longer exist (or never existed at all). Rather, the starting point for understanding the *Alogi* must begin with the author of this account. Indeed, the whole quest of clarifying the nature, provenance, dates and theology of the *Alogi* up to the present has not properly taken into account the unique aspects of Epiphanius as historian and heresiologist.

### 5.1 Epiphanius as Historian and Heresiologist

At least three possibilities exist that would explain Epiphanius' account of this heresy. First, he may have had in his cache of works an unknown source that spoke of such a group, and he drew upon this work for his testimony of the *Alogi*. Second, he could have simply concocted the entire account, and the *Alogi* has no textual or historical foundations at all outside his own imagination. Third, Epiphanius could have constructed a heretical sect that would encompass a variety of issues surrounding the Gospel and Apocalypse of John of which he was made aware from reading the testimonies of his predecessors.

The previous section have rendered the first possibility untenable. As to the second possibility, it is conceivable that Epiphanius was clever enough to create a fictitious heretical sect out of thin air. After all, Epiphanius is capable of all sorts of historical exaggeration where his imagination is presented as fact. The examples are plentiful. There is the heroic tale of Epiphanius bravely resisting the lustful advances of a multitude of Gnostic seductresses who, 'with great boldness tried to seduce [Epiphanius]... because they desired [him] in [his] youth.' Epiphanius records that he 'escaped without being ensnared by their bait,' and subsequently reported these women to the local bishops so that those who were 'hidden within the church' (about eighty altogether) could be driven out of the city (*Haer.* 26.17.4–9). Also, in his witness against the *Alogi* Epiphanius claims to have personally drunk out of one of a number of streams and rivers—including the Nile—that annually turn into wine as a commemoration of the first miracle of Jesus turning water into wine (*Haer.* 51.29.7–51.30.3). Moreover, Rufinus, an admirer of Origen, blasts Epiphanius for

deceitfully boasting to a large crowd that he had read six thousand of Origen's works (*Adv. Rufinum* 2.21–23), which Epiphanius denied (cf. Jerome *Adv. Rufinum* 2.22). Later, however, he flaunts his knowledge of Origen's six thousand works in his polemic against the 'Origen heresy' (*Haer.* 63.9).

Further evidence of Epiphanius' creative historicizing may be seen in the way he structured his *Panarion*. The first twenty entries in this work, for example, address pre-Christian 'heresies'. Four of these ('Barbarism', 'Scythianism', 'Hellenism', and 'Judaism') derive from Epiphanius' reading of Colossians 3:11 in which Paul states, 'Here there is not Greek and Jew, circumcised and uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave, free; but Christ is all, and in all' (ESV). In taking his lead from the Apostle Paul, Epiphanius retroactively creates a history for these groups in which they are culpable for denying Christ well before the incarnation (*Haer.* 1.1.9).

It is true that Epiphanius is often guilty of hyperbole, but does that mean that the entire testimony of the *Alogi* is a baseless, creative fiction, and if so how does one tell? The examples above are entirely sustained by Epiphanius' testimony alone and incapable of being corroborated, but this is not the case with his testimony of the *Alogi*. Rather, Epiphanius' testimony corresponds to aspects of a number of earlier sources. The remaining chapters of this work demonstrate that the *Alogi* has textual roots and thus cannot be solely a concoction of Epiphanius' imagination.

Finally, what about the last possibility? Did Epiphanius construct a heretical sect that never properly existed in an historical sense but is representative of various issues that he deemed heretical surrounding the Gospel and Apocalypse of John that arose in the early Church? A close examination of the lengthy portrayal of the *Alogi* in conjunction with corroborating evidence from the testimonies of earlier Church Fathers points to the conclusion that Epiphanius is not referring to a person or group of people at all. Rather, as with his historicizing pre-Christian 'heresies' based on the words of Paul, Epiphanius feels free to create a 'history' of the *Alogi* from the words of his predecessors. The evidence suggests he amalgamates various issues that were noted by his predecessors surrounding the Johannine literature into a single category under an appropriate heading, the *Alogi*. Thus, whereas the issues that Epiphanius records are real, the group itself is not. In fact, this is not the only heresy in the *Panarion* that suffers from questionable historical grounding.

### 5.1.1 'Abstract Heresies' in the *Panarion*

Clearly, Epiphanius possesses a certain fecundity of imagination and is fully capable of recording as fact elements that are not historically true. The *Panarion* betrays various examples of his abstract heretical groups. Perhaps



the clearest example is the group known as the *Angelics* (*Haer.* 60). Epiphanius includes this sect in his *Panarion* despite the fact that he admits he knows absolutely nothing about them other than their name (*Haer.* 60.1.1). He is aware of them only through hearsay, nevertheless he is quick to denounce their views, whatever those actually might have been. As Young Kim notes, 'The example of the Angelics exemplifies Epiphanius' strategic use of heresy. The Angelics were essentially a non-existent heresy chosen to suit Epiphanius' architecture for the *Panarion*; and in this case, the lack of detail hinted at a deliberate and free application of the notion of heresy.'<sup>1</sup>

Epiphanius refutes other heresies about which he admits to knowing very little. For example, in his introduction to the sect known as the *Adamians* (*Haer.* 52) Epiphanius confesses that he has only heard of such a group. He has not found it in any treatise, nor has he encountered anyone who espouses the views he ascribes to this heresy (*Haer.* 52.1.6). He goes on to express his own doubts about the existence of such a sect (*Haer.* 52.1.9),<sup>2</sup> but concludes that even if it is just hearsay, such a group is 'worth mentioning' (*Haer.* 52.1.8–9). This is seen again in his account of the *Valesians* (*Haer.* 58). Here, Epiphanius claims to have heard about them, but he confesses to know nothing about Vales, from whence he came, or what his teachings were (*Haer.* 58.1.1).

Likewise, Epiphanius rails against the so-called group of *Origenists* (*Haer.* 63)—not to be confused with the followers of Origen (cf. *Haer.* 64)—for their sexual misconduct.<sup>3</sup> Once again, Epiphanius is the only extant source to mention this group. Epiphanius is well known for his disdain for Origen, and although he claims that he does not know the origins of this title, his appeal to ignorance may be inauthentic. As John Dechow has argued, 'All heresies, in Epiphanius' mind, are ultimately related to the mode or content of Origen's thought.'<sup>4</sup>

There are also questions that surround the historical legitimacy of other sects and their titles in the *Panarion*, such as the *Antidicomarians* (*Haer.* 78)

1 Kim, 19.

2 εἶτε γὰρ ἔστιν ἢ τοιαύτη εἶτε μὴ ἔστι. *GCS* 31,2, *Epiphanius* II, 312.

3 Although Epiphanius claims that he is unsure of the origins of the name for this heresy, he hints it may in fact be Origen who is known as Adamantius the Author (cf. *Adv. Rufinum* 1.9; *Haer.* 64) or some other Origen. Yet in the very next heresy in the *Panarion* in which he denigrates the theological positions of the historical Origen Adamantius (*Haer.* 64), Epiphanius is again not inclined to link Origen with these 'Origenists' of *Panarion* 63 outside of Origen's supposedly similar sexual issues (cf. *Haer.* 64.3.10–13). See John Dechow, *Dogma and Mysticism in Early Christianity: Epiphanius of Cyprus and the Legacy of Origen*. Patristic Monograph Series 13 (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988), 128–135.

4 Dechow, *Dogma*, 13.

and the *Collyridians* (*Haer.* 79). Epiphanius readily admits that he had to come up with his own title for the *Antidicomarians* (Proem I 4.8, 5.9). He portrays this group as being guilty of wrongly believing that Mary consummated her marriage to Joseph after the birth of Jesus (*Haer.* 78.1.3).<sup>5</sup> Such a thought was unconscionable to Epiphanius, for he held that Mary remained a virgin her entire life, and thus he describes them as opponents (*ἀντιδίκος*) of Mary. On the opposite end of the spectrum lies the sect to which Epiphanius gives the title *Collyridians*. He accuses them of an overzealous glorification of Mary by offering sacrifices of small loaves of bread (*κολλύρις*) in her name. The historical existence of this group has been called into question, particularly as 'Epiphanius is the only early heresiologist to name the "Collyridians", and later references seem to derive from him, rather than having independent worth.'<sup>6</sup> Just as he describes the *Antidicomarians* as 'opponents' of Mary and *Collyridians* is a witty title for those who offer small loaves of bread to Mary, the *Alogi* (*Ἄ-λογοι*) is certainly a clever pejorative that Epiphanius stamped onto those whom he believes rejected the Johannine Logos.<sup>7</sup>

What do these examples of Epiphanius' abstract heresies reveal about the *Panarion*? In such instances, Epiphanius clearly has *some* information, but

5 This appears to be the view of Victorinus of Pettau, as noted by Jerome in a letter against Helvidius (*Ad. Helvidius* 19). Helvidius apparently formulated his opinions based on a commentary on Matthew by Victorinus. Likewise, Jerome notes that Victorinus was an imitator of Origen (*Ep.* 61.2). See W. Weinrich (ed.), *Revelation: Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture, New Testament XII* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2005), xxi, n. 43.

6 A. Cameron, 'The Cult of the Virgin in Late Antiquity: Religious Development and Myth-Making,' in *The Church and Mary. Studies in Church History* 39 (Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2004), 7. See also, Ross Shepard Kraemer, 'Women and Gender,' in *Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*, eds. Susan A. Harvey and David G. Hunter (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 474. It is possible that such a group did exist, but even Geoffrey Ashe, who has offered his own attempt at reconstructing the history of this sect, admits that his portrayal belongs to the world of 'historical fiction'. Geoffrey Ashe, *The Virgin* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1976), 149–71, esp. 161. Ashe claims his reconstruction is 'strictly functional' (170). Some, however, have argued that the Collyridians are a splinter group of the Montanists. '[W]e do know that the Montanist movement carried in itself the seeds of what, under favorable conditions, could develop into the cult that Epiphanius called the Kollyridians.' Stephen Benko, *The Virgin Goddess: Studies in Pagan and Christian Roots of Mariology. Studies in the History of Religions* LIX (Leiden: Brill, 1993), 193. Here Benko reiterates the connection already made in Michael P. Carroll, *The Cult of the Virgin Mary: Psychological Origins*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), 45.

7 'Epiphanius says that he himself coined the names, 'Alogi,' 'Antidicomarians,' and 'Collyridians,' and he may have done the same in other cases.' F. Williams (ed.), *Panarion* I, xviii.

given the fact that he has no direct knowledge of these groups, he is left to fill in the blanks himself. There are three categories of information from which he claims to have composed this heresiologue: those sects about which he learned from careful study, those about which he has only learned through hearsay, and those he has experienced firsthand (Proem II 2.4). F. Williams suggests adding an additional category, 'In some cases we should add a fourth to these: historical conjecture on Epiphanius' own part.'<sup>8</sup> Thus, in his endeavor to provide a list of eighty heresies (cf. Proem I 1.2–3),<sup>9</sup> Epiphanius' number of known sects may have fallen short of the goal. Thus, he resorted to manufacturing a few along the way, based on his limited knowledge. Such sects are a blend of fact and fiction, where he presents the sources available to him through the filter of his imagination.

These creative elements are indicative of the overall mindset of Epiphanius, which has been explored in depth by Young R. Kim. His Ph.D. dissertation, aptly titled 'The Imagined Worlds of Epiphanius of Salamis,' demonstrates that although many scholars have mined the *Panarion* for information about heresies, they have overlooked what this treatise indicates about the frame of mind and personality of the man who wrote it. His study aims to, 'reveal how much more complex, deep, misunderstood, and slightly demented, if not radically devoted, this man was.'<sup>10</sup> Kim proves this by means of exploring his role throughout the *Panarion* as a geographer, biographer and historian. In each of these areas, he makes a solid case for understanding Epiphanius' tendency to perceive and construct a world on the basis of his own beliefs and convictions that sometimes stood in sharp contrast to the realities of the Roman world in which he lived.<sup>11</sup> By understanding the complexities of Epiphanius' view of the

---

8 Ibid., xix.

9 Epiphanius promises at the beginning of the *Panarion* to address eighty 'heresies' that correspond with the eighty concubines mentioned in Song of Songs 6:8–9.

10 Kim, 1. For more, see 1–25.

11 Ibid., 21. Kim argues, for example, the division between 'orthodoxy' and 'heresy' determined his views of geography, where he draws boundaries around those regions that gave rise to prominent heretics and those that maintained a stronger Nicene confession. For his role as biographer, Kim highlights Epiphanius' portrayal of the lives of Origen, Mani and Arius, where Epiphanius suggests that their heretical status was the product of their Greek education. This was to serve as a warning to other Christians about the dangers of mingling faith with Greek culture; it also emphasized Epiphanius' connection between what Kim calls 'Romanness' and orthodoxy. For his imagined history, Epiphanius' flexible view of 'heresy' gave him the ability to make determinations about pre-Christian 'heresies' such as Greek philosophical schools and Jewish sects on the one hand and the 'proto-orthodox' Christianity that is clearly seen in the first Adam on the other.

world as seen through the *Panarion*, it is possible to gain a greater appreciation how Epiphanius 'imagined and envisioned his world.'<sup>12</sup>

It is inevitable that Epiphanius' worldview would have great influence on his composition of the *Panarion*. As a fierce defender of Nicene orthodoxy, Epiphanius considered anything that failed to cohere to this standard as theologically suspect. There was no room for grey in his black-and-white perspective. Not only is this seen in the way he conceives of history, biography, and geography as Kim has demonstrated, it is also seen in the way he portrays the heresies throughout the *Panarion*.

### 5.1.2 *Epiphanius' Conception of 'Heresy' and 'History'*

Each of the refutations of heretical sects throughout the *Panarion* demonstrates that Epiphanius has a unique understanding of what it means to be heretical. Exactly how Epiphanius conceives of 'heresy' has been the subject of a number of studies,<sup>13</sup> which suggest that his notion of what constitutes 'heresy' must be understood in broad and flexible terms.

It is impossible to derive a narrow definition of what Epiphanius means by 'heresy' based on his *Panarion*. He includes 'arch-heretics' such as Marcion and Cerinthus in this work alongside more abstract 'heretics' such as the *Angelics* or *Adamians*. Epiphanius praises other groups such as the *Audians* (*Haer.* 70) for their piety, but nevertheless condemns them for their minor theological deviations from Nicene orthodoxy. Some heresies are splinter groups from within Christianity, while others such as non-Christian philosophies never claimed to exist inside the bounds of true belief.<sup>14</sup> Although Epiphanius' notion of heresy may be flexible, there is a common attribute to each of the sects he includes in his *Panarion*: all of them are guilty in one way or another of forsaking the truth. For Epiphanius truth and heresy were antonyms, and thus anyone that did not demonstrate true Christian piety or hold to the faith passed down from Christ through the apostles were heretical.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., 26.

<sup>13</sup> For more on Epiphanius' conception of 'heresy' see Williams (ed.), *Panarion* 1, xviii; Frances M. Young, 'Did Epiphanius know what he meant by Heresy?' *Studia Patristica* 17 (1983): 199–205; Pourkier, *l'Hérésologie*, 85–91; J. Rebecca Lyman, 'The Making of a Heretic: The Life of Origen in Epiphanius *Panarion* 64,' *Studia Patristica* 31 (1997): 445–451; Kim, 16ff.; and Alain Le Boulluec, *La notion d'hérésie dans la littérature grecque II<sup>e</sup>–III<sup>e</sup> siècles*, 2 Vols. (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1985), vol. 1, 18–19.

<sup>14</sup> Young, 200.

<sup>15</sup> Kim, 17–18.

Some have taken Epiphanius' broad and seemingly inconsistent notions of heresy as indicative of him simply being confused.<sup>16</sup> D.J. Chapman claims he was capable of any amount of 'muddleheadedness.'<sup>17</sup> Other epithets describe Epiphanius as the 'narrow-minded enemy of the heretics'<sup>18</sup> and 'being known for garbled reporting.'<sup>19</sup> Although it is true that he is prone to confusion and that he takes certain liberties with his portrayal of some heresies, such sentiments that portray him primarily as a heresiological bumbler are not altogether warranted. Epiphanius takes proper belief and praxis seriously, and his two major works demonstrate his efforts to convince others to uphold the same standards as himself. His earlier work, the *Ancoratus*, or 'well-anchored person', is his attempt to convey the proper views of the Trinity such that, once the reader understands it, he or she too might be 'anchored' in the faith. The *Panarion* is Epiphanius' soul-saving resource for believers to avoid the venomous bites of the heresies.<sup>20</sup> The pastoral attention of Epiphanius in steering others along the path of right belief is often overshadowed by the severity of his rhetoric, but perhaps the former ought to be used as a lens through which to interpret the latter.

It is 'out of extreme love' for the servants of God that Epiphanius wrote his *Panarion* (Proem II, 2.6). His primary concern in this work is, as he states, to provide his fellow believers with a defense of the truth and true religion (Proem I, 2.1). He admits from the beginning that there are times where his anger over the heresies will cause him to lose his temper in the way he portrays these sects, but in the same breath he also notes twice that this is due to his desire to protect the reader (Proem I, 2.3–4). As bishop, Epiphanius takes his role as the shepherd of his flock seriously, and he certainly feels the responsibility for leading other believers in distant regions. However, he does not compare with earlier heresiologists such as Justin, Irenaeus and Hippolytus, who overcame the heresies by means of sharp wit and superior intellect. Rather, he conquers his enemies often by way of insult and ridicule, wrapped in layer upon layer of scriptural justification for his views.

Thus, there are two fundamental ways to conceive of Epiphanius as a historian and heresiologist. From a strictly historical perspective, his account,

16 Young, 201.

17 Chapman, 53 n. 1.

18 Hans von Campenhausen, *The Fathers of the Greek Church* (London: A. & C. Black Ltd., 1963), 152.

19 William L. Petersen, *Tatian's Diatessaron: Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance, and History in Scholarship*, *VCSupp* 25 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 39.

20 His other work, *De Mensuris et Ponderibus*, also exhibits well his concern for proper belief.

while valuable especially for its preservation of lost materials that he cites throughout his work, is at times questionable due to the fact that it is riddled with inaccurate reports, exaggerations and uncorroborated assertions.<sup>21</sup> If, however, one views this account as the product of a concerned bishop who desired to issue warnings to his fellow believers against false belief, then the *Panarion* takes on a different tone. It is a complete refutation of everything that Epiphanius deemed to be heretical, regardless of the fact that he may have taken liberties in the way he portrays certain sects. At times, this would take the form of abstract heresies such as the *Angelics*, *Adamians* and *Valesians*, about which Epiphanius has very little if any information. He sees the *potential* of such beliefs as a danger to the Christian fold, regardless of whether or not there existed specific groups that would have defined themselves according to the views Epiphanius links with them. Perhaps he constructed these heresies as a strategic way of achieving his total number of sects, or maybe his limited information was enough for him to warrant their creation and inclusion in his *Panarion*. The opinions espoused by the group he calls the *Alogi* certainly earned themselves a lengthy treatment in his catalogue of heresies, but this testimony may better reflect Epiphanius' concerns as a leader of the Christian fold to protect the theological truth of Christianity rather than to portray the historical truth of this sect's existence. The absence of understanding and accounting for Epiphanius' methodology has left many to assume he simply garbled facts from the accounts of his predecessors. Most notably, many have argued that he was reliant primarily (if not solely) on the lost work(s) of his predecessor, Hippolytus of Rome.

## 5.2 Dissociating Hippolytus from the *Alogi*

Epiphanius derives much of his information for his *Panarion* from a number of earlier sources, but he has been accused of being heavily reliant upon one of his predecessors in particular, Hippolytus of Rome. This is certainly a frequent accusation of his testimony of the *Alogi*, such as T.H. Robinson's label of Epiphanius as the 'arch plagiarist' of Hippolytus.<sup>22</sup> Such views persist despite the fact that no extant work of Hippolytus appears to show any knowledge of this group.<sup>23</sup> In fact, the evidence stacks up in favor of a very different

21 Cf. Photius, *Bibl.* 122.

22 Robinson, 494, referring to the work, 'Heads against Gaius'. See the similar sentiments in Grant, 'Fourth Gospel,' 108; Culpepper, *John*, 122.

23 Cf. Chapter 1.2.

conclusion; the presumption of Hippolytan origins of the *Alogi* is unnecessary and misguided. In contrast, the internal evidence of Epiphanius' account of the *Alogi* provides clear evidence that this heresy originated with Epiphanius himself.

### 5.2.1 *The Hippolytus Question*

Before addressing the question of whether or not Hippolytus knew of the *Alogi*, it is important to recognize that there are many ambiguities that surround this figure and his works. That a person with this name was an important figure in the early church is certifiable; whether or not it is possible to know with any degree of certainty where and when he lived, which works he wrote, and whether or not there existed multiple persons by this name who were active in the early third century church is a matter of contention.

The traditional portrayal of Hippolytus paints him as an active member of the church in Rome at the dawn of the third century. He is said to have been a staunch opponent of monarchianism. He is also known for his sharp criticisms against the Roman bishop Callistus (218–222 AD), which has added to his reputation of being a schismatic church leader and the first antipope of the Christian church in Rome. Hippolytus is also credited with a sizeable literary output, ranging from theological works to commentaries on Scripture and polemics against heresies. Although this is the common way of calibrating the vast array of evidence ranging from the corpus of works ascribed to him to archaeological evidence and patristic sources, for well over a century there have been persistent questions regarding whether or not this evidence can actually be aggregated in such a way to paint a coherent picture of Hippolytus of Rome.

Eusebius (*HE* 6.20) and Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 61) speak of a man by the name of Hippolytus who presided over a church, though neither mentions where. They also portray him as a prolific writer of various exegetical works in addition to a polemic against the heresies. Eusebius lists seven works of Hippolytus, five of which correspond to the list of eighteen provided by Jerome. Some of the titles provided by Eusebius and Jerome appear to correspond to a list of thirteen works inscribed on the plinth of a statue of Hippolytus, originally discovered in a mutilated state, the figure being unrecognizable, though representative of a woman. On its side is etched a paschal calendar that appears to match Eusebius' notice of a similar work by Hippolytus. There are other titles listed on the back of the statue, some of which bear similarities to those of Jerome's list of Hippolytan works, as well other works noted in the later record of Photius. On the basis of these correlations as well as the putative location of its discovery, the statue was restored to resemble Hippolytus and the works



inscribed on the plinth were added to his literary legacy. However, these works, the statue's reconstruction, and the supposed location of its discovery are all far from certain.

Apollinaris of Laodicea, in a fragment from his commentary on Daniel, notes a certain 'Hippolytus, most holy bishop of Rome'.<sup>24</sup> About the same time, Theodoret, in his work, the *Eranistes* (1.88), suggests Hippolytus was an *eastern* writer, but he provides him with no specific location. He gives excerpts from nine works of Hippolytus, none of which match the lists of Hippolytan works of Eusebius or Jerome. In the ninth century, Photius (*Bibl.* 121) records that Hippolytus was a pupil of Irenaeus, and he lists an obscure work of Hippolytus, the *Syntagma Against Thirty Two Heresies*. Dionysius bar Salibi suggests the existence of a Hippolytan work that was written against a certain Gaius, and Ebed-Jesu lists other works that are otherwise unknown.<sup>25</sup> The latter does not mention his provenance, yet bar Salibi clearly refers to him as *Hippolytus Romanus*. The eastern provenance of Ebed-Jesu and bar Salibi in addition to their unique information about Hippolytus have contributed to further confusion surrounding his provenance and corpus of works.

When it comes to references to Hippolytus, there is a good cache of evidence; however, when attempts are made to bring this evidence into a coherent portrait of the man and his works, there is plenty of room for confusion. For example, why do the lists of Hippolytan works from various sources vary so widely? Why is he portrayed as a protégé of Irenaeus and a Roman schismatic antipope in some of the evidence, and an eastern writer elsewhere? Were there two early Christian writers by the name of Hippolytus, one from Rome and one from the east, each writing various works that were to become collected into a singular corpus due to confusion surrounding the fact that there were two persons with the same name? Or was there a single, itinerant Hippolytus, either from the east or from Rome, who is responsible for the entirety of the works that are ascribed to him?

Answers to these questions vary widely. Some argue for a singular *Oriental* Hippolytus, others for a singular *Roman* Hippolytus, and still others for a multiplicity of Hippolyti.<sup>26</sup> Although the issues are far from settled, throughout

24 See A. Mai (ed.), *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio e Vaticanis codicibus*. 10 Vols. (Rome: Typis Vaticanis, 1825–1838), i, II, 173.

25 See Assemani, *BO* III.1, 15.

26 The literature on the Hippolytus Question is extensive. Major contributions include that of Döllinger, Adolf von Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bei Eusebius*, 2 pts., 4 vols. (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1893–1904), i, 2, 605–46; Pierre Nautin's argument that some works ascribed to Hippolytus actually belong to a certain Josephus as recorded by Photius: *Hippolyte et Josipe* and *Le dossier*; the modifications of Nautin's thesis and a new division of Hippolytan works by Vincenzo Loi et al., *Ricerche su Ippolito* *Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum* 13 (Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum,



this work, I shall provisionally assume the traditional view of a singular, Roman Hippolytus who was active at the beginning of the third century and the author of all the works ascribed to him, except in those cases where I have specific concerns over the veracity of certain claims to Hippolytan authorship.

### 5.2.2 *The External Evidence: The Alogi and the Question of Hippolytan Origins*

There are three primary pieces of evidence to support the hypothesis that Hippolytus knew of the *Alogi*: (i) the argument of R.A. Lipsius, which suggests that Epiphanius and another fourth-century Church Father, Philaster of Brescia, used the lost *Syntagma* of Hippolytus as the foundation for their own heresiological works; (ii) a statue of Hippolytus, which has etched on its plinth a work whose title reflects concerns over the Gospel and Apocalypse of John; and (iii) the later Syrian evidence of Dionysius bar Salibi and Ebed-Jesu, who record the putative debate between Gaius and Hippolytus, which was explored in the previous chapter.

#### 5.2.2.1 Lipsius and the Question of Epiphanius' Dependence upon Hippolytus

In 1865, Lipsius was the first to argue for the reliance of Epiphanius, Philaster of Brescia and Ps.-Tertullian upon a common document (*Grundschrift*). This shared source was presumed to be Hippolytus' lost *Syntagma Against Thirty-Two Heresies*, noted by Photius (*Bibl.* 121).<sup>27</sup> Lipsius noticed parallels between the heresiological catalogues of Epiphanius, Philaster and Ps.-Tertullian, and surmised that all three were dependent upon Hippolytus' *Syntagma*. From these three works, he attempted to reconstruct the list of heresies that comprised the lost *Syntagma*. According to Lipsius, the work of Ps.-Tertullian, *Adversus Omnes Haereses*, preserved the list and order of the lost thirty-two heresies of the *Syntagma*, effectively acting as a summary of this work. His theory is still widely accepted to this day.<sup>28</sup>

---

1977); Miroslav Marcovich's introduction to the critical edition: *Hippolytus Refutatio Omnium Haeresium* PTS 25 (New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1986), 1–51; the argument for a Hippolytan school by Brent, *Hippolytus*, esp. 368ff. and Cerrato. A worthwhile summary may be found in Ronald E. Heine, 'Hippolytus, Ps.-Hippolytus and the early canons,' in *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*. Edited by Frances Young, Lewis Ayres and Andrew Louth (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004): 142–51.

27 R.A. Lipsius, *Zur Quellenkritik des Epiphanius* (Vienna: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1865), 16–32.

28 However, see the important critique of Lipsius' theory in general by Sebastian Moll, 'Three Against Tertullian: The Second Tradition About Marcion's Life,' *JTS* 59/1 (April, 2008), 169–80, esp. 172ff.

The many parallels between Ps.-Tertullian and Epiphanius strengthen the argument that Epiphanius made extensive use of the *Syntagma* in the *Panarion*, however there are difficulties in assigning the *Alogi* to this lost Hippolytan work. Though it is impossible to know for certain which heresies were in Hippolytus' lost *Syntagma*, it is telling that Ps.-Tertullian's work makes no mention of such a group. Thus, Lipsius maintained that since the *Alogi* were not included in Ps.-Tertullian's work it should not be a part of his reconstructed *Syntagma*.<sup>29</sup> However, Adolf von Harnack and Theodore Zahn argued for the likelihood that Hippolytus *did* refute the *Alogi*, suggesting the possibility that the work noted on the plinth of the statue of Hippolytus (ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατὰ Ἰωάννην εὐαγγελίου καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως) may have been adjoined to the *Syntagma*.<sup>30</sup> Nevertheless, Lipsius held his ground and his reconstruction of the *Syntagma* includes no mention of the *Alogi*.<sup>31</sup>

Lipsius' <i>Syntagma</i>	Ps.-Tertullian	Epiphanius	Philaster
28) Quartodecimans	*Blastus (AOH 8) <sup>32</sup>	50) Quartodecimans 51) <i>Alogi</i>  52) Adamians	58) Quartodecimans 60) Heretics that do not accept John or Revelation
29) Theodotus	Theodotus (AOH 8)	53) Theodotus	50) Theodotus Byzantius

29 Lipsius, *Quellenkritik*, 23–8.

30 Adolf von Harnack, *Zeitschrift für historische Theologie*, 11 (1874), 162–170, *Chronologie*, 227; *History of Dogma*. Trans. James Millar, vol. 111 (Oxford: Williams & Norgate, 1897), 14. See also Theodore Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* vol. 1 (Erlangen: Verlag von Andreas Deichert, 1888–1890), 223 (also vol. 11, 970, 977). For Lipsius' response to Harnack, see *Die Quellen der ältesten Ketzergeschichte* (Leipzig, 1875), 93ff.

31 For an expanded table of the works of these authors, see Lightfoot, *AF* i 2, 415–18.

32 \*Ps.-Tertullian refers to Blastus as a person with Quartodeciman convictions. In Pacianus' *Epistola ad Sympronian. de catholico nomine*, ch. 2 a certain Blastus is described as a Montanist in addition to being a Quartodeciman. Irenaeus is known to have written a letter to Blastus (*On Schism*) that is no longer extant, addressing Blastus' heretical teachings in Rome. These may have been the impetus for his fall from the presbyterate (*HE* 5.20.1; 5.15). Eusebius connects Blastus with Florinus, who also fell from the same presbyterate, however Florinus was a gnostic (*HE* 5.15; 5.20.1).

Although no heresy fitting the description of the *Alogi* is recorded by Ps.-Tertullian, the other source in the triad of Lipsius' reconstruction, Philaster, does mention a similar heretical group (*Div. Her. Lib.* 60). The critical question is whether Philaster derived his information from Epiphanius or another independent source.

Epiphanius and Philaster were contemporaries, and although it is difficult to know with certainty when Philaster composed his *Diversarum Hereseon Liber*, it does appear to post-date Epiphanius' *Panarion* and *Ancoratus*.<sup>33</sup> Philaster relays a similar description as that of Epiphanius' notice of the *Alogi*, only in much shorter form. He redacts the title and replaces it simply with 'others', a common designation throughout this work.

Others (*Alii*) after these are the heretics who do not accept (*non accipiunt*) the Gospel of John and his Apocalypse, and since they do not understand the virtue of Scripture nor do they wish to learn, they persist, persistently being lost in heresy, and also they dare to say that <the Gospel according to John> and his Apocalypse are not of the blessed John the Evangelist and Apostle, but Cerinthus (*non beati Iohannis euangelistae et apostoli, sed Cerinthi heretici*), who at the time when he was clearly a heretic, was thrown away from the Church by the blessed Apostle.<sup>34</sup>

If Philaster derived his information about this group from Epiphanius, as the evidence suggests,<sup>35</sup> it is not likely to have come from the brief notice of the *Alogi* in Epiphanius' *Ancoratus* because no mention of Cerinthus is made there (*Ancor.* 2.13). In this case, he must have summarized the details he found in the *Panarion*. This is not the only instance where Philaster mimics information from the *Panarion* that is not found elsewhere. For example, the Sabellians (*Haer.* 62; *Div. Her. Lib.* 54), Paul the Samosatian (*Haer.* 65; *Div. Her. Lib.* 64), the Manicheans (*Haer.* 66; *Div. Her. Lib.* 61) and the Photinians (*Haer.* 71;

33 Philaster's work was composed around 384 AD Lightfoot (*AF*, i, 2, 415) argues for a date around 380. Epiphanius' *Panarion* was begun in 374–375 AD ('the eleventh year of the reigns of Valentinian and Valens and the eighth of Gratian's'; *Haer.* Proem II 2.3) and completed about three years later. The *Ancoratus* was written in 374 AD in which he outlined the heresies that were to comprise the *Panarion* (*Ancor.* 12.7–13.8).

34 *CSEL* 38 (Vindobonae: F. Tempisky, 1898), 31–32.

35 See Klijn and Reinink, 14–18. In addition to Philaster, they also indicate other areas of reliance on Epiphanius by Ps.-Hieronymous, Augustine and Dionysius bar Salibi. Bludau (154ff.) also sees Philaster as dependent upon Epiphanius.

*Div. Her. Lib.* 65) are all sources common to Epiphanius and Philaster, but are absent from the witness of Ps.-Tertullian and Hippolytus' *Refutatio*.

A number of scholars have overlooked the fact that Lipsius did *not* include the *Alogi* in his reconstruction of Hippolytus' lost *Syntagma*. For example, at the end of the nineteenth century, George Fisher claims that Lipsius proved that Hippolytus was the first to speak of the *Alogi*.<sup>36</sup> John Gwynn, states that Lipsius has made it 'practically certain' that Epiphanius and Philaster are indebted to the lost *Syntagma* for their information about this group.<sup>37</sup> Later, in his affirmation of Lipsius' theory Gustave Bardy would pronounce, 'on se rend compte qu'Épiphané a trouvé sans doute dans le *Syntagma* du prêtre romain l'essentiel de sa notice.'<sup>38</sup> Moreover, Robert Grant asserts, 'The whole of Epiphanius' fifty-first chapter against the *Alogi*, as has been realized since 1865, is based on Hippolytus.'<sup>39</sup>

The fact remains, however, that there is absolutely no allusion to the *Alogi* anywhere in the work of Ps.-Tertullian. Lipsius' argument that the *Alogi* were not included in the *Grundschrift* may therefore be correct.<sup>40</sup> Rather, the evidence suggests that Philaster's notice of a similar group came by way of Epiphanius, not Hippolytus. There are other scholars who agree. As Labriolle notes, it is unlikely that Philaster knew the original heretical texts, but rather summarized ecclesiastical sources, and thus, 'It hardly seems open to doubt, although this has been contested, that he had before him the *Panarion* of St Epiphanius.'<sup>41</sup> He also argued that the *Syntagma* was not foundational for Epiphanius' testimony of the *Alogi* either.<sup>42</sup> For his part, August Bludau is in total agreement: Philaster got his information from Epiphanius.<sup>43</sup> William Tabbernee has also noted that recent scholarship has generally concluded that

36 George P. Fisher, *Some Remarks on the Alogi* (New York: Knickerbocker Press, 1892), 3.

37 Gwynn, 407. In light of the bar Salibi evidence, Gwynn states (408), '[T]he theory of Lipsius concerning the relation between the *Panarion* of Epiphanius and the lost *Refutation of the Thirty-two Heresies* of Hippolytus, has received independent and strong confirmation.'

38 Bardy, 371.

39 Grant, 'Fourth Gospel,' 108.

40 Labriolle, *Sources*, LXXV.

41 Pierre de Labriolle, *The History and Literature of Christianity from Tertullian to Boethius*, trans. Herbert Wilson (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1968), 299. He also states, 'Que conclure d'une telle lacune, sinon que dans le *Syntagma*, les Aloges n'avaient point trouvé place? D'autre part, la notice de Philastre, extrêmement sèche et courte, coïncide avec les données fondamentales d'Épiphané (encore que le nom d'«Aloges» n'y soit pas reproduit), et il est probable que Philastre s'y inspire du *Panarion*.' (*Sources*, LXXV)

42 Labriolle, *Sources*, LXXV.

43 Bludau, 154–5.

the similarities between Philaster, Epiphanius and Ps.-Tertullian cannot be explained by a shared source. Rather, 'The agreement between Epiphanius and Filaster is due to Filaster's use of Epiphanius' treatise. Epiphanius in turn used Pseudo-Tertullian, but Filaster appears not to have used Pseudo-Tertullian.'<sup>44</sup>

Given that the theory regarding Epiphanius' dependence on the *Syntagma* for his portrayal of the *Alogi* is unlikely, it is necessary to inquire into other possible Hippolytan sources. One would naturally turn next to Hippolytus' *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium* (*Elenchos*) as a likely possibility. Yet while there are definite parallels that may be drawn between some of the sects in the *Panarion* and the *Refutatio*, the latter excludes any allusion to the *Alogi* or any opposition to the Gospel and Apocalypse of John.<sup>45</sup> Thus, out of the possible heresiological works from Hippolytus, neither the *Syntagma* nor the *Refutatio* demonstrate that he was aware of a heretical group that matched the description of the *Alogi*. There is, however, another major piece of evidence that may indicate Hippolytus wrote against this sect.

#### 5.2.2.2 The Statue of Hippolytus

Is it possible that Hippolytus refuted the *Alogi* in his lost work, ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατὰ Ἰωάννην εὐαγγελίου καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως, listed on the back of the plinth of the statue of Hippolytus in Rome? Scholars from Lightfoot and Robinson up to Smith have argued that this work was indeed the ultimate source of Epiphanius' *Alogi* and Dionysius bar Salibi's commentaries.<sup>46</sup> However, such an argument is not as clear-cut as it may seem.

First, the argument that this work was the source of Epiphanius (and others) presumes that the statue and its list of works are to be associated with Hippolytus of Rome—a point that is of intense debate.<sup>47</sup> At the heart of the issue is the fact that the statue was originally found by Pirro Ligorio in the

44 Tabbernee, *Fake Prophecy*, 75.

45 See Pourkier, *L'Hérésologie*, 67–8, 105. See also Smith, 'Gaius,' 209; Harris, 51–2.

46 Lightfoot, *AF* i, 2, 394–5; Robinson, 494; Smith, 'Gaius,' 209; Bludau, 165; and Prigent, 'Hippolyte,' 407–412. Labriolle argued that Epiphanius used either (or both) the Hippolytan work *Heads against Gaius*, noted by the later Syrian writer Ebed-Jesu, and *Defense of the Gospel etc.* in his chapter on the *Alogi*. (Labriolle, *Sources*, LXXI).

47 Pierre Nautin has argued that the works are more appropriately to be attributed to a certain Josephus based primarily on the testimony of Photius who attributes some of the works found on the statue to a person of this name (*Bibl.* 48; 121), however Nautin's works have not received widespread agreement. See Nautin, *Hippolyte et Josipe; Hippolyte, Contre les heresies*.

sixteenth century in a mutilated state, missing its upper part.<sup>48</sup> Thus, it is unclear whose image this statue originally represented. Yet the works noted on the plinth of the statue are presumed to be original and date to the first quarter of the third-century. Because of the location of the statue's discovery, which is also a matter of debate,<sup>49</sup> and because some of the titles on the plinth of the statue corresponded with known works of Hippolytus of Rome, it was reconstructed accordingly and it now stands at the entrance to the Vatican Library in Rome. Nevertheless, it has been demonstrated that the original statue was actually of a female figure—possibly Themista of Lampsacus, or Hippolyta.<sup>50</sup>

Even if this work is by Hippolytus, there is reason for caution in assuming that it was the singular source for Epiphanius' *Alogi*. The traditional rendering of the transcription of the work on the plinth of the statue reads ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατὰ Ἰωάννην εὐαγγελίου καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως, which many scholars have associated with the title of a work of Hippolytus provided by Ebed-Jesu in his *Catalogue: ἀπολογία ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰωάννου*.<sup>51</sup> Regarding these two notices, Lightfoot argued, 'From the preposition (ὑπὲρ, not περί) and from the association of the two works together, it is a safe inference that this was an apologetic work, directed against those persons who objected to both works alike.'<sup>52</sup> Streeter agreed, noting that the title itself demonstrated a coordinated

48 See Brent, *Hippolytus*, 9–10, who records Ligorio's own description of the location and statue (as found in *ms.*, Naples XIII B 7, p. 424). Here Ligorio describes the statue as being 'in certe ruine'.

49 Ibid., 9–38; also Margherita Guarducci, 'La 'Statua di Sant' Ippolito' e la sua provenienza,' in *Nuove ricerche su Ippolito*, *Studia Ephemeridis Augustiniana* 30 (Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1989), 61–74, who argues against the reliability of the testimony of Ligorio concerning the location of his discovery.

50 The statue and the works inscribed on it is the focal point of Allen Brent's work on Hippolytus. For a brief summary of the issues surrounding the statue of Hippolytus, see E. Prinzivalli, 'Hippolytus, Statue of' in *EEC*, I, 385; Heine, 'Hippolytus,' 142–51. That the statue was originally represented a female was noted by Margherita Guarducci, 'La statua di 'Sant'Ippolito' in Vaticano,' *Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia* 47 (1974–75), 163–90. For the statue as Themista of Lampsacus see M. Guarducci, 'La Statua di « Sant'Ippolito »' in *Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum* 13 (1977), 17–30. For the statue as Hippolyta, see M. Vinzent, 'Hippolyt von Rom und seine Statue,' in *zur Zeit oder Unzeit. Studien zur spätantiken Theologie-, Geistes- und Kunstgeschichte und ihrer Nachwirkung*. Hans Georg Thümmel zu Ehren, eds. A.M. Ritter, W. Wischmeyer, and W. Kinzig. Texts and Studies in the History of Theology, 9. (Cambridge, 2004), 125–34.

51 Greek translation of the original Syriac title of Ebed-Jesu's *Catalogue* is found in Lightfoot, *AF*, i, 2, 150.

52 Ibid., 394.

backlash to the Johannine literature: 'No one defends what nobody attacks. We must, then, infer that there were people who rejected both.'<sup>53</sup>

But as Brent points out, M. Guarducci has detected a [τ]α before the ὑπέρ.<sup>54</sup> She was preceded in this notion long ago by H. Achelis, who indicates the existence of the article in his list of Hippolytan works on the statue.<sup>55</sup> I have also examined the statue myself, and the existence of an alpha before 'ὑπέρ' is undeniable. Although a crack in the statue has destroyed the top portion of the letter, that which remains is clearly recognizable. A very careful eye would be able to see it in the image provided by Brent in his recent work.<sup>56</sup> Moreover, if one follows the left margin from the bottom of the works listed on the rear corner of the statue (over the right shoulder of the figure), there is enough room for a tau before the alpha, but nothing more. Thus, the word ἀπολογία could not have been a part of that original title. It is true that ὑπέρ plus the genitive may indicate an apologetic work, but it is not the only solution. As Brent notes, it is also possible that the title may also be rendered more broadly as 'matters concerning the Gospel according to John and Apocalypse' (i.e. [τ]α ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατὰ Ἰωάννην εὐαγγελίου καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως).<sup>57</sup>

Nevertheless, many remain confident that it is an apologetic work and that Epiphanius and the bar Salibi commentaries reflect and preserve its contents. Here again, it must be noted that the tendency to assume that this work was a defense of the Johannine literature is predicated on its association with the work of Hippolytus listed in the *Catalogue* of Ebed-Jesu. It is true that the titles bear some resemblance, yet there are major differences as well. As Brent notes, the titles are not identical: not only does the title on the statue exclude any indication that it was an apologetic work, the order of the Johannine works are in reverse order from those of Ebed-Jesu's *Catalogue*.<sup>58</sup> Just because Ebed-Jesu mentions an apologetic work whose title is similar to that on the statue, it does not necessarily follow that the title on the statue must have been an apologetic work as well.<sup>59</sup>

53 Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 437.

54 Brent, *Hippolytus*, 172. Nautin's list of works on the statue reflects this as well. See Nautin, *Hippolyte et Josipe*, 18.

55 H. Achelis, 'Hippolytstudien,' *TV* Heft 4 (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1897), 4.

56 See Brent, *Hippolytus*, pref., plate 5—'Plinth: Inscription of List of Literary Works'.

57 Ibid., *Hippolytus*, 172. See also Hill, *Johannine Corpus*, 184.

58 Brent, *Hippolytus*, 172.

59 Contrary to Achelis ('Hippolytstudien,' 6), who argues that the two titles are identical.



Ebed-Jesu's *Catalogue* does not provide the only explanation for this work listed on the statue. It is known from the writings of Dionysius of Alexandria, for example, that there were questions regarding the authorship of these works (cf. *HE* 7.25). Eusebius, in his comments on Papias' testimony, suggests that there may have been two different persons named 'John' who wrote these works (*HE* 3.39.6). Earlier, Dionysius of Alexandria makes the same point as well (*HE* 7.25). Thus, Hippolytus could have addressed the concerns over Johannine authorship for the Gospel and Apocalypse in this work. Brent argues that it may have addressed the Johannine dating of the Crucifixion on Passover Day, which was a major concern for the Hippolytan community, though I find this questionable given that this is not a prominent theme in the Apocalypse.<sup>60</sup>

Finally, there is no indication from the title on the statue that Hippolytus wrote it as a polemic against Gaius. Just as there is no room on the statue for the word ἀπολογία, it is also true that the title could not have read Κεφάλαια κατὰ Γαῖου ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατὰ Ἰωάννην εὐαγγελίου καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως, as Harris suggested.<sup>61</sup> There is, in fact, no clear indication that any Hippolytan work served as the proof-text upon which Epiphanius and others relied for all of the information of the *Alogi*. Yet there is one additional argument for a connection between Epiphanius and Hippolytus that must be explored regarding the possibility that Hippolytus was the original source of the name *Alogi*.

### 5.2.3 *The Internal Evidence: Hippolytus and the Title Alogi*

In his testimony, Epiphanius claims responsibility for the title *Alogi*, but some have argued that it actually came from Hippolytus. The primary argument for this view, touted by Lightfoot, Harris and others, is a comparison of the title *Alogi* with Hippolytus' reference to the heretic Noetus as 'ἀνόητους' ('unintelligent'; *Ref.* 9.10.9). They argue that Epiphanius, in his argument against the Noetians, likely derived this notice from Hippolytus Νοῆτου ἔχων ὄνομα, ἀνόητος ὑπάρχει καὶ οἱ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἀνοητοῦντες (*Haer.* 57.6.4).<sup>62</sup> Thus, if Hippolytus was

60 Brent, *Hippolytus*, 172. See 63–5, where Brent provides solid evidence connecting this issue with the Gospel of John, but nothing to directly associate it with the Apocalypse.

61 Harris, 46.

62 Lightfoot originally believed that Epiphanius' use of the *Alogi* was 'avowedly his own invention.: J.B. Lightfoot, 'Internal Evidence for the Authenticity and Genuineness of Saint John's Gospel' in *The Fourth Gospel and Its Authorship*, (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1892), 134. He would later change his mind, suggesting instead that, 'Indeed we may suspect that Epiphanius borrowed the name ἄλογοι 'the irrational ones' from Hippolytus; for these jokes are very much in his way; e.g. νοητός, ἀνόητος...' (cf. *C. Noet.* 8; *Ref.* 9.10). *AF*, i, 2, 394. See also J.B. Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays* (London: MacMillan and Co., 1893), 119. Harris later agreed with this assessment of Lightfoot, arguing, 'the presence of the title



clever enough to prefix an alpha before 'Noetus', it is likely he did the same for 'Logos' (*viz.* a-logoi) and spoke of such a group that rejected the Gospel and Apocalypse of John in one of his lost works. However, Hippolytus' use of 'ἀνόητους' may not be as significant as many suggest.

For one thing, as Marcovich notes in the critical edition of the *Refutatio*, in this passage (*Ref.* 9.10.9) ἀνόητους is actually transmitted as νοητούς in Codex Parisinus suppl. gr. 464 f. 112r, the only full manuscript to preserve books IV–X of the *Refutatio*.<sup>63</sup> Furthermore, in other places where it would have been natural for Hippolytus to have used the term ἀνόητους, no such instance occurs. For example, *C. Noet.* 3, reads οὐκ ἤδη δέ, εἰ Νοητὸς μὴ νοῇ, παρὰ τοῦτο ἔκβληται αἱ γραφαί, and *C. Noet.* 8 reads Νοητὸς μὴ νοῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν.<sup>64</sup> If ἀνόητους is a truly significant wordplay by Hippolytus, one would have expected to clearly see it at least in these citations and possibly other places throughout his work *Contra Noetus*, however no other such instances exist.

Furthermore, the title *Alogi* never appears in the extant Hippolytan corpus. There are various instances where one finds derivations of the Greek word beginning with 'Alog-', however, an examination of these occurrences demonstrates that not a single one could be interpreted as similar to Epiphanius' *Alogi*.<sup>65</sup> Attributing this title to Hippolytus is perhaps forcing something to be

---

*Alogi* is probable in the book or table of heresies upon which Epiphanius is working' Harris, 51–2. See also Smith, 'Gaius,' 217–21. Nautin (*Hippolyte, Contra les heresies*, 69) also noted, 'dans ces notices du *Panarion* l'image d'ensemble la plus fidèle des notices correspondantes du *Syntagma*.'

63 Marcovich, 347. So also it is found to be nohtou.j in Millerus in editione pricipie Oxoniensi; see L. Duncker and F.G. Schneidewin, eds. *S. Hippolyti Episcopi et Martyris: Refutationis Omnium Haeresium: Librorum Decem Quae Supersunt* (Gottingae: Sumptibus Dieterichianis, 1859), 448. Harris was aware of this transmission, but he ignores its significance. See Harris, 51.

64 Harris, 51; also 6–8.

65 A search of 'ἀλογ-' and all the possible lexical derivations in the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae database offers thirteen possible derivations and only twenty-two total instances of these derivations in the extant Hippolytan writings (transliterated): (1) 'Ἀλογα' occurs three times: *Dan.* 2.4; *Ref.* Prologue 1; *Ref.* 4.10. (2) 'Ἀλογον' occurs three times: *Ref.* 9.17, 10.5, 10.31. (3) 'Ἀλογος' occurs once in *C. Noet.* 10.2. (4) 'Ἀλογου' occurs once in *Fragmentum in Genesim* 4.23. (5) 'Ἀλογους' occurs once in two different editions: *Fragmenta in Proverbia* (Achelis) Frag. 6 line 6; *Fragmenta in Proverbia* (Richard) Frag. 6 section 5 line 2. (6) 'Ἀλογων' occurs twice: *Ref.* 5.7, 5.16. (7) 'Ἀλογως' occurs four times: *Fragmenta in Psalmos* [sp.] (Achelis) Frag. 9 line 52; *Ref.* 4.42, 6.21, 10.19. (8) 'Ἀλογω' occurs once: *Ref.* 10.33. (9) 'Ἀλογιας' occurs once: *Ref.* 7.36. (10) 'Ἀλογια' occurs once: *Fragmenta in Psalmos* [sp.] (Achelis) Frag. 22 line 24. (11) 'Ἀλογιστου' occurs once: *Ref.* Prologue 1. (12) 'Ἀλογιστως' occurs once: *Ref.* 6.19. (13) 'Ἀλογιστω' occurs once: *Ref.* 10.5.

the case that simply is not. Rather, there are alternative sources that may have influenced Epiphanius' creation of this title. As Hill notes, one possibility may be Dionysius of Alexandria, who refers to those who rejected the Apocalypse as 'unintelligible and illogical' (ἄγνωστόν τε καὶ ἀσυλλόγιστον; *HE* 7.25.1). Hill states, '[these] alpha-privative adjectives . . . could have given Epiphanius the idea for his pejorative "Ἀλογοί, aptly taken from John 1:1, 14.'<sup>66</sup> Even if Hill is correct, and I suspect he is, Epiphanius is still ultimately responsible for the title *Alogi*. It is a clever designation with a *double entendre*: the *Alogi* aptly represents those who are without the Logos as well as those who are without reason, or 'irrational ones'.

Not only is there little reason to suggest Hippolytus came up with the title *Alogi*, it is also clear that the other evidence such as the statue of Hippolytus and the Hippolytan corpus of works—both extant and lost—does not warrant the conclusion that Epiphanius relied solely upon Hippolytus for his account of the *Alogi*. An examination of the internal evidence of Epiphanius' testimony as well as careful look at the broader context in which Epiphanius places the *Alogi* will provide further clarity as to whether or not this heresy, both in name and in substance, was his own construction.

### Summary

Epiphanius' background and theology influenced his view of heresy as any real or imaginary threat to Nicene orthodoxy. Thus, various sects in the *Panarion* including the *Alogi* reflect Epiphanius' creative historicizing. Although the *Panarion* is often criticized for its lack of historical precision, some scholars have recently suggested that it offers a window into the way Epiphanius manipulated and constructed his own concept of heresy in order to establish an 'orthodox' way of seeing the world. One underappreciated aspect of this is the number of 'abstract heresies' in the *Panarion*, which are essentially straw-man sects that he manufactured in order to present and refute erroneous beliefs that were not necessarily the official tenets of a specific person or organized group. By his own admission, he had to provide his own titles for certain 'abstract heresies' such as the *Antidicomarians* and the *Alogi*. Elsewhere he admits to knowing nothing about the *Angelics* other than their name; yet this does not prevent him from presenting and refuting what he presumes to have been their beliefs. Thus, rather than inheriting the information on these and other abstract sects from Hippolytus or another predecessor, Epiphanius based these accounts on a blend of hearsay or scanty source information and historical conjecture.

66 Hill, *Johannine Corpus*, 187.

## Epiphanius' *Alogi* in Context

Epiphanius' unique perspective on history and heresy is evident throughout his account of the *Alogi*. His presentation is erratic, complex, and broadly conceived. His attention to detail and his compulsion to maintain orthodoxy at all costs can become so overwhelming both to himself (and the reader) that any attempt at providing a clear flow of thought can quickly erode into rambling. And yet amidst the chaos there is a discernible strategy that he employs throughout this account. By outlining his account of the *Alogi* and establishing the contexts behind his comments, one can detect that this testimony is a well-intentioned, imaginative, and somewhat misguided attempt at a sweeping defense of the four-fold Gospel canon.

### 6.1 Outline of the Account of the *Alogi*

The form and content of this account demonstrate that Epiphanius alone is responsible for the creation of this heresy. There are four major sections to the literary structure of his record of the *Alogi*. He opens his discussion with a general introduction (*Haer.* 51.1.1–51.2.5), followed by a lengthy treatment of the arguments of the *Alogi* against the Gospel of John (*Haer.* 51.3.1–51.31.11), which dominates his description of this sect.<sup>1</sup> A very brief discussion of the arguments against the Apocalypse comprises the third section (*Haer.* 51.32.1–51.34.8), followed by Epiphanius' concluding remarks (*Haer.* 51.35.1–4).

#### 6.1.1 The Introduction

Throughout his testimony there are various indications that Epiphanius took certain creative liberties with this heresy. This is seen clearly in his introduction:

Therefore these *Alogi* ("Ἀλογοί)—for this is the name I am giving to them. From now on, they shall be so called, beloved. We shall call them this name, these *Alogi*, for they held to the heresy for which [that] name <was worthy>: they rejected the books of John. Since they do not accept the Word, which John has preached, they will be called *Alogi*. Being absolute

---

<sup>1</sup> Approximately ten times the amount of discussion is devoted to the Gospel of John as compared to that of the Apocalypse.

strangers to the message of truth, they deny the purity of the message and accept neither the Gospel of John nor the Apocalypse. And if they accepted the Gospel, but rejected the Apocalypse, we would say they are doing it on account of precision—not accepting an ‘apocryphon’ because of the deep and dark sayings in the Apocalypse. But when they do not receive the books which are preached from Saint John, it is clear to everyone that they and those like them are those concerning whom Saint John said in his general epistles, ‘It is the last hour, and you heard that the Antichrist is coming and now behold there are many Antichrists’ (1 Jn. 2:16) . . . For they say that these works are not from John but Cerinthus and are not worthy to be affirmed in the Church (*Haer.* 51.3.1–6).<sup>2</sup>

And it can be shown from this hostility that, ‘They neither understand what they are saying nor what they maintain strongly’ (1 Tim. 1:7). For how can the words against Cerinthus be by Cerinthus? Cerinthus says that Christ is ‘recent’ and only a man, but John has proclaimed that [Christ] is the eternal Word who has come from on high and been made flesh. Therefore their frivolous attack has been put to shame as a false accusation and unaware from where it is refuted. For they appear to believe as we do, but not holding to the certainties that are from God revealed to us through Saint John, they will be convicted of shouting against the truth about things that they do not know. They will be known to them, if they return to sobriety of mind and knowingly understand; for we are not rejecting the teachings of the Holy Spirit, which are important and authoritative (*Haer.* 51.4.1–4).<sup>3</sup>

This introduction points to the fact that Epiphanius is creating a heretical group that is otherwise unknown.<sup>4</sup> This is seen not only in the fact that he

<sup>2</sup> GCS 31,2 *Epiphanius II*, 250–1.

<sup>3</sup> GCS 31,2 *Epiphanius II*, 251.

<sup>4</sup> In addition to these direct mentions of the name *Alogi* in the introduction, there are two other references to the *Alogi* in this chapter of the *Panarion*, located in the middle and latter portions. In *Haer.* 51.17.10, Epiphanius asks rhetorically, ‘What are they thinking—those who have deceived their own mind and vomited this heresy on the world that refuses the Gospel according to John? I was right to call their heresy ‘*Alogi*’ because they will not accept the divine Word who came from on high—the Word which John has preached.’ Again, Epiphanius says in *Haer.* 51.28.4, ‘And those who have rejected the Gospel according to John have been put to shame. I am right to call them *Alogi* since they throw away the Word of God—the Word of the Father that was preached by John, which has come down from heaven and accomplished our salvation [through] his advent in the flesh.’ Another reference is found in Epiphanius’ earlier work, the *Ancoratus*: ‘The *Alogi*, who do not accept the Gospel and the

repeatedly claims responsibility for this group's title, it is also corroborated by the fact that there is not a single mention of the *Alogi* by any other early Church Father prior to Epiphanius. Thus, when it is said, 'Recent scholarship has therefore dismissed the Alogoi from the stage of history [because we] have no evidence of such a group,'<sup>5</sup> it is clear that there is at least *some* recognition of the problem of corroborating Epiphanius' testimony with those who came before him.

### 6.1.2 *The First Objection to the Gospel of John*

After the introduction, Epiphanius spends a great deal of time presenting and rebutting the first objection of the *Alogi* (51.4.5–21.32). At first glance, Epiphanius' defense seems counterintuitive, for he launches into a lengthy discussion about the fact that the gospels do in fact differ in their beginnings. Beginning with Matthew's gospel, Epiphanius preserves and expands the Papiian tradition about the origins of the gospels. Yet he notes that God had given individual assignments to each of the Gospel writers to correct errors that arose from the mishandling of the gospel(s) that had gone before (51.6.2–7). So, Matthew's gospel produced some errant theological perspectives from the likes of Cerinthus, Ebion, Merinthus, Cleobius, and others (51.6.7) that were then corrected by the Spirit in calling Mark to write the gospel spoken by Peter. Mark (or Peter) felt no need to rehash the words of Matthew about the generations of Christ, which led still other 'stupid people' to find fault with *this* gospel text (51.6.14, 7.1). Once again, then, the Spirit guides Luke to write *another* gospel to set things straight (51.7.1–12.1). Yet even here there arose some misguided arguments by Porphyry, Celsus, and others that Luke's gospel is unreliable (51.8.1–4).

At each point Epiphanius goes to great lengths to demonstrate that the gospels are *precise* and *coherent* (51.10.3, 10.6, 15.3, 17.13, 21.14, et al.). They may indeed *appear* to contradict one another, but that is merely the opinion of those who are too ignorant to see the Spirit's work in issuing Gospels that complement one another without the need to reiterate all that had been said before.

---

Revelation of John' (*Ancor.* 2.13). There are three additional, albeit rather benign appearances of the title *Alogi* in the *Panarion*: one where Epiphanius introduces the Theodotians as an 'offshoot of the heresy of the *Alogi*' (*Haer.* 54.1.1), one in Proem 1 (4.5; 5.6), and one further reference in the fourth Anacephalaeosis, where Epiphanius again takes credit for this epithet. There is some question of the authenticity of the Anacephalaeoses in the *Panarion*. For more on this see F. Williams (trans.), *Panarion 1*, 16–17 and Kim, 16–17.

5 Culpepper, *John*, 122.

Epiphanius thus makes a lengthy argument for the compatibility and divine inspiration of all four gospels whilst the first objection remains unanswered. It is not until 51.12.6–17.3 that Epiphanius provides a proof for the fact that John's chronology *does* permit ample time for the temptation. The reader then finds himself puzzled at the fact that Epiphanius then elaborates on the *Alogi*'s first objection by adding the detail that these heretics also declared this Gospel 'non-canonical' (ἀδιόθετον, 51.17.10–18.1, 6). Puzzlement quickly turns to fatigue as Epiphanius, unlike the gospels, reiterates and develops all that had been said before, relating to gospel coherence (51.18.2–21.32).

### 6.1.3 *The Second Objection to the Gospel of John*

By the time Epiphanius arrives at the second objection of the *Alogi* he is over two-thirds of the way through what would be his entire account of this heresy. At 51.22.1–2 one reads of the *Alogi*'s charge that John's Gospel mentions *two* Passovers that Jesus kept over the course of two years but the Synoptics only mention *one*. To disprove this assertion Epiphanius traces the life of Christ from the date of His birth in the forty-second year of the Roman Emperor Augustus (51.22.3, 19). The arrival time of the Magi is included (51.22.17) as is a list of thirty consulships to show that Christ was thirty years old when He began His ministry (51.22.1–30).

Having significantly veered off course, Epiphanius then finds himself going even further by taking the evidence he has mounted thus far as an opportunity to disprove the Valentinians' claim that their number of Aeons (30) was the same as the age of Christ when He died (51.23.3–28.1). As I shall argue later,<sup>6</sup> Epiphanius takes this opportunity to gently correct the earlier views of Irenaeus (*AH* 2.22.3) as well. After establishing his chronological pre-eminence over the Valentinians and *Alogi*, Epiphanius proceeds twice over to retrace the timeline of Jesus' life from the moment of birth through the temptation, trip to Capernaum, and wedding at Cana (51.24.1–27.6, 29.2–31.10). All of this was done to make his point that the Gospels do not contain one or two Passovers, but *three* (51.23.6).

### 6.1.4 *The Objections to the Apocalypse*

Epiphanius spends very little time on the objections to John's Apocalypse. The first appears at 51.32.1–3 and is swiftly decimated by the time the reader reaches 51.32.10. The same is true for the second and third objections to the Apocalypse and Epiphanius' responses (51.33.1–10, 34.1–8).

6 See Chapter 7.2–3.

### 6.1.5 *The Conclusion*

Epiphanius concludes his account of the *Alogi* with the charge that this group has not received the Holy Spirit's words spoken through the Apostle John. As such, they are condemned for having committed the unforgivable sin (Mt. 12:32; *Haer.* 51.35.3). As with the conclusion to every other heretical entry, Epiphanius then proudly proclaims to have trampled this pesky little heresy.

This brief survey of Epiphanius' account demonstrates the complicated and, at times, incoherent nature of this sect. For many scholars, this is just another piece of evidence to demonstrate the erratic nature of Epiphanius' writing. This may be true in part, but one can also see within the complexity of this account the broader, multilateral attack Epiphanius is engaging against all who would detract from the divine integrity and coherence of the four-fold Gospel. A closer look at the broader context in which Epiphanius conceives of the *Alogi* will make this clear.

## 6.2 *The Broader Context of the Alogi*

In order to fully understand Epiphanius' record of the *Alogi* it is necessary to consider the historical context from which these objections arose. Given the chronology of *Panarion*, Epiphanius places this group around the end of the second century or the beginning of the third, a particularly fertile time for various heterodox theologies and orthodox counter-polemics. As such, scholarly estimations have suggested that the *Alogi* emerged as a renegade orthodox group that rejected the Johannine literature in an attempt to eradicate a certain form of heresy, most notably either Montanism or Gnosticism (or both). However, Epiphanius provides no clear indication that the *Alogi* were engaged in a theological or textual battle with either of these 'heresies'. Although it is true that Epiphanius' primary accusation against the *Alogi* is their rejection of the Johannine literature, a careful reading of this testimony suggests that his concerns are much broader.

### 6.2.1 *The Problem of Four Gospels*

Epiphanius devotes more than ninety per cent of his testimony of the *Alogi* to the issue of the compatibility of the Gospels. His chronological placement of the *Alogi* fits squarely within the second-century church's efforts to make sense of the fact that there were four different written Gospel accounts of the life and ministry of Jesus. The problem of this aporia is evident in a number of ways. For one thing, the mere fact that there exist four different Gospel accounts does not in itself point to the credibility of a singular Gospel message. Is one



Gospel more authoritative than the others? Further complicating matters is the fact that the collective biographical accounts of Jesus' life and ministry in these four Gospels are at times varying in the presentation of content or chronology. This raises further questions of reliability: which Gospel preserves the most authentic account? The variances between the Gospels are particularly evident when one juxtaposes the broadly similar chronology of the Synoptics Gospel with the different framework of John. The differences in the contours of the Synoptics are far less pronounced than the apparent discrepancies that are found when the Fourth Gospel is added to the mix. And here is where one finds the familiar territory of the objections to the Gospel of John not only by the *Alogi*, but also for many others in the second-century.

The *type* of objections espoused by the *Alogi* was in no way new to the history of the early church at the time that Epiphanius penned his *Panarion*. Various critics highlighted the differences between the gospels in order to call their reliability into question. Moreover, Epiphanius' response in which he appeals for the necessity of a four-fold Gospel canon is far from groundbreaking. Various responses to gospel criticisms had been proffered by numerous Church Fathers prior to Epiphanius. The entire account of the *Alogi* and their criticisms of the Gospel of John are emblematic of a period of time from the second century onward in which the four-fold Gospel was indeed an issue recognized by those within and outside the Church. Although the scope of the *Alogi's* official objections is limited to the Gospel of John, it is important not to miss the fact that Epiphanius makes it clear that his response to these criticisms is nothing less than his own apology for the necessity of the four-fold Gospel canon—a defence that originates over two centuries earlier.

Beginning in the second century, the four-fold Gospel was met with questions, criticism and ridicule from opponents of Christianity; it was also an area of concern within the church. What emerged at first as criticisms against the plurality and discrepancies of the Synoptic Gospels was eventually broadened to include attacks on the very divergent portrayal of the life of Jesus recorded in the Johannine Gospel in comparison to that of the Synoptics. In addition to the criticisms of the *Alogi* against John's Gospel, Epiphanius records and responds to other objections to all four gospels from various groups; and he devotes a substantial amount of his testimony to refuting them. These views are on par with those of the *Alogi*, and it is interesting that Epiphanius does not draw a strong distinction between other critics of the gospels and the *Alogi*. In particular, Epiphanius goes to great lengths to refute the criticisms of Cerinthus and the Ebionites. He also refutes the objection from three other



critics, Porphyry, Celsus and Philosabbatius. In doing so, he is accomplishing his main task of offering a broad defense of the four-fold Gospel canon.

### 6.3 Epiphanius' *Alogi*: A Sweeping Defense of the Four-fold Gospel

#### 6.3.1 *Cerinthus and the Ebionites*

There were some who rejected the four-fold Gospel by means of only recognizing one gospel, which was then used to support a wayward theology. One such category of people to which Epiphanius often refers in his discussion of the *Alogi* is that comprised of Cerinthus and the Ebionites, who chose only to accept the gospel of Matthew (*Haer.* 30.3.7; cf. *AH* 1.26.2, 3.11.7; *HE* 3.27.4). According to Irenaeus (*AH* 1.26.2), both Cerinthus and the Ebionites denied the virgin birth, arguing that Jesus was the product of natural generation of Mary and Joseph. Jesus was therefore fleshly and capable of suffering, but he was endowed with the spiritual 'Christ' that descended upon him at his baptism in the form of a dove. Because of its impassibility, this spiritual 'Christ' departed from Jesus just prior to his Passion, leaving the fleshly Jesus to suffer on the cross.

Epiphanius has plenty to say against these groups. References and rebuttals to the adoptionistic perspective of Cerinthus and the Ebionites are found in the introduction to the *Alogi* (*Haer.* 51.2.3–4, 51.4.1–2), in his discussions of the Gospel of Matthew (*Haer.* 51.6.6–9), Mark (*Haer.* 51.6.12–14), and Luke (*Haer.* 51.7.2–5, 51.10.4–51.11.3, 51.20.4). Moreover, in his discussion of the baptism and temptation of Jesus, Epiphanius clearly singles out those who hold to this adoptionistic christology. He appeals to Lk. 2:49 in order to refute 'the word of those who say that he became the Son of God at the time of his baptism, when the dove—which they say is Christ—came upon him' (*Haer.* 51.20.5).

According to Epiphanius, the theological errors of Cerinthus and the Ebionites persisted even though the Synoptic Gospels did not preach such a position (*Haer.* 51.11.5–12.1), so the Holy Spirit compelled John to write his gospel to correct their Christological views (*Haer.* 51.12.2–8, 51.19.3–5, 51.20.3; cf. 51.2.3–4; 51.4.1). Although *Haer.* 51 is technically a refutation of the *Alogi*, throughout his testimony Epiphanius is constantly engaged in refuting Cerinthus and the Ebionites. Why does he constantly refer back to these groups? Is Epiphanius simply losing track of the issue at hand—something he is known to do—or does this point to the fact that the scope of the identity of the *Alogi* is broader than originally thought? To clarify this, we turn to another example.

### 6.3.2 *Celsus, Porphyry and Philosabbatius*

In addition to his ongoing refutation of Cerinthus and the Ebionites, Epiphanius dedicates a portion of his account of the *Alogi* to another group of critics. He states that the Greek philosophers Porphyry, Celsus and Philosabbatius tried to refute the gospels because they did not understand the gospel message as it was given through the Holy Spirit (*Haer.* 51.8.1). The premise of these objectors, as with the *Alogi*, is that the gospels are untrustworthy because of the contradictions that exist between them.<sup>7</sup> This is how Epiphanius relays their criticism:

And so some other Greek philosophers, I mean Porphyry and Celsus and Philosabbatius, who is a dreadful, deceitful snake from the Jews, accuse the facts of the gospels through the overthrow of the holy apostles; being natural and fleshly, leading their war according to the flesh and, being powerless, they cannot please God; and they have not understood that which is <said> by the Spirit.

For each <of them>, striking against the words of the truth because of the blindness of their ignorance, in their attacks on this say: "How is it possible that the day of his birth in Bethlehem has a circumcision eight days later, and forty days after a journey to Jerusalem and the things Simon and Anna did for him, when on the night he was born it says an angel appeared to him, after the magi had come to worship him and opened the bags and offered him gifts? As it says, 'An angel appeared to him saying, "Get up, take your wife and the child, and go to Egypt, because Herod is looking for the life of the child.'" (Mt. 2:13) If he was taken to Egypt on the night he was born, and was there until Herod died, how is it possible that he remained [in Bethlehem] for eight days and be circumcised? Or how is it possible after forty days,<sup>8</sup> as it is found in Luke, who is lying?" They say this blasphemously against each of their own heads, because he says, "On the fortieth day they brought him to Jerusalem and <returned> into Nazareth." (cf. Lk. 2:22, 39; *Haer.* 51.8.1–4).<sup>9</sup>

7 On the subject of Gospel contradictions in the early church, see esp. the works of H. Merkel, *Widersprüche Zwischen Den Evangelien: Ihre polemische und apologetische Behandlung in der Alten Kirche bis zu Augustin*, WUNT 13 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1971); and *Die Pluralität der Evangelien: als theologisches und exegetisches Problem in der Alten Kirche*. *Traditio Christiana* 111 (Bern: Peter Lang, 1978).

8 Clearly implying Luke's account of Jesus' journey to Jerusalem.

9 GSC 31,2 *Epiphanius II*, 258.

Allen Brent has suggested that Porphyry, Celsus and Philosabbatius are the only named members of the *Alogi*.<sup>10</sup> He is partially correct; Epiphanius includes them as members of the *Alogi*, and yet there are certainly others that he includes as well, not as a heretical fraternity that actually existed but as examples of bad theology and wrong approaches to scripture.

It is interesting that Celsus and Porphyry were not contemporaries<sup>11</sup> and that the objection Epiphanius attributes to these critics has nothing to do with the Johannine literature, yet Epiphanius still includes them in his account of the *Alogi*. If the *Alogi* were an historical group that opposed the Johannine literature, why would Epiphanius include these figures that were active in different centuries and whose criticism has nothing to do with either the Gospel or Apocalypse of John? It is because the scope of Epiphanius' *Alogi* is much broader than merely those who willingly criticized the Johannine corpus.

Celsus was a philosopher and outspoken critic of Christianity and the earliest opponent whose work has survived (at least in part). Fragments of Celsus' *The True Doctrine* (ἀληθὴς λόγος), written between 177–180,<sup>12</sup> are preserved in the counter polemic of Origen's *Contra Celsum*, written some seventy years later.<sup>13</sup> It is apparent from Celsus' attacks that he is familiar with the Gospels and finds their lack of overall coherence to be a major strike against the validity of Christianity. For Celsus, Christianity was a threat to the Hellenistic religious culture and the 'ancient tradition' to which he adhered. Among other scurrilous accusations, he also argued that it was an unfounded secret society that represented a real threat to the Roman Empire.

Celsus' arguments against Jesus as a divine figure and Christianity in general are articulated through a fictitious Jewish character he employs as his spokesperson (*C. Cels.* Pref. 6; 1.28).<sup>14</sup> For Celsus the truth of Jesus is not that which is portrayed in the Gospels, for their stories are inventions (*C. Cels.* 2.13, 26). Origen records a specific objection to the Gospels in this way: 'After this he

10 'He (Epiphanius) does not name any of the Ἀλογοί, with the exception of Porphyry, Celsus, and Philosabbatius, who are rightly described as τινες ἄλλοι ἐξ Ἑλλήνων φιλοσόφων who criticised all the Gospels.' Brent, *Hippolytus*, 143.

11 Philosabbatius is unknown apart from this notice of Epiphanius.

12 For this date I follow the analysis of H. Chadwick (ed., trans.) *Contra Celsum* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), xxviii. Merkel (*Widersprüche*, 9) suggests a date around 178 AD. Hengel (*Johannine Question*, 6) thinks it could date as early as 160.

13 Cf. Chadwick, *Contra Celsum*, xiv–xv; Merkel, *Widersprüche*, 9.

14 Celsus' presentation of a Jewish mouthpiece for his criticisms may be in response to Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*. Some have pointed to the fact that Celsus' *True Doctrine* may be in response to Justin's doctrine of the Logos. See D. Rokéah, *Justin Martyr and the Jews* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 5, n. 11.

(Celsus, or his Jew) says that *some believers, as though from a drinking bout, go so far as to oppose themselves and alter the original text of the gospel three or four or several times over, and they change its character to enable them to deny difficulties in face of criticism*' (C. Cels. 2.27).<sup>15</sup>

The exact meaning of Celsus' charge here is unclear. Origen's rebuttal to this criticism indicates that he believed Celsus to be referring to the alterations of the Gospel by the Marcionites, Valentinians and the followers of Lucan. As Chadwick notes, Origen may have been correct, but he also leaves the door open for what many have considered to be a reference to the canonical four.<sup>16</sup> If Celsus did intend the four Gospels as a number of scholars have suggested,<sup>17</sup> his criticism would indicate he believed there to be one original Gospel upon which the four derived their information. One could also infer that one of the four was the Gospel of John because of a number of references in his work point to the fact that he knows the Fourth Gospel, suggesting that it may have already been in a place of authority in the early church at the time of Celsus' critique.<sup>18</sup>

A century after the *True Doctrine*, Celsus' criticisms against Christianity and its textual foundations had become the platform of a voluminous work by Porphyry of Tyre, *Against the Christians* (κατὰ Χριστιανῶν). Due to the fact that his fifteen books were burned by order of Theodosius II and Valentinian III, the extant material survives only in a fragmentary nature from quotations extracted from later sources.<sup>19</sup> The common view of the date of this work places

15 Translation from Chadwick (ed., trans.) *Contra Celsum*, 90.

16 Chadwick, *Contra Celsum*, 90, n. 2. He also provides the parenthetical notice that '(it is just conceivable that the phrase shows knowledge of those who rejected St John)'. Cf. Merkel, *Widersprüche*, 11.

17 See Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 22–3; Hill, *Johannine Corpus*, 310; Stanton, 'Fourfold Gospel,' 325; Tj. Baarda, 'Διαφωνία—Συμφωνία, Factors in the Harmonization of the Gospels *Especially in the Diatessaron of Tatian*,' in *Essays on the Diatessaron* (Kampen, The Netherlands: Pharos, 1994), originally published in W.L. Petersen (Ed.), *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text and Transmission* (South Bend, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 133–54; R.M. Grant, *The Earliest Lives of Jesus* (London: SPCK, 1961), 59–60; N. Perrin 'The Diatessaron and the Second-Century Reception of the Gospel of John,' in *The Legacy of John: Second-Century Reception of the Fourth Gospel*, ed. Tuomas Räsänen (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 315.

18 On this see Hill, *Johannine Corpus*, 309–11; Hengel, *Johannine Question*, 6, n. 23.

19 The lion's share of our textual information of Porphyry's work comes from Jerome and Macarius. For a brief account of the compilations of these fragments, see T.D. Barnes, 'Porphyry *Against the Christians*: Date and the Attribution of Fragments,' *JTS* ns. 24 (1973), 424–30; A.B. Hulén, *Porphyry's Work Against the Christians: An Interpretation*, Yale Studies in Religion 1 (Scottdale, PA: Mennonite Press, 1933); Merkel, *Widersprüche*,

it around 270 AD, although Timothy Barnes has pointed out that this dating relies on a 'fragile chain of deduction', and the work more properly belongs around the early years of the fourth century.<sup>20</sup> In either case it would not be long before Porphyry's work prompted a swift response by various ecclesiastical Fathers.

Jerome records that the attacks of Porphyry were met with a sustained counterattack by Methodius, Eusebius and Apollinaris. Methodius wrote a response of around ten thousand lines—a meagre rebuttal when compared to Eusebius' twenty five books 'Against Porphyry' and Apollinaris' thirty (*Ep.* 70.3 *Ad Magnum*). Porphyry was certainly the beneficiary of the work of Celsus, who noted apparent contradictions between the beginnings of the Gospels. Yet Porphyry shows a greater meticulousness in respect to his criticisms of Christian Scripture regarding the contradictions and discrepancies he sees in Christian literature. Many of his surviving arguments have a more religious than philosophical or political emphasis.<sup>21</sup> Nevertheless, a common thread of both these critics was their attempt to discredit Christian texts such as the Gospels in order to nullify the validity of the Christian faith.

The only extant information of the Jewish critic Philosabbatius is recorded here by Epiphanius. No other extant writing appears to mention such a figure. Nevertheless, Epiphanius includes him along with Celsus and Porphyry as one who shared in a common criticism against the Gospels.

Because of the absence of original works by these critics, it is difficult to know for certain what constituted Epiphanius' source(s) of this criticism. It is possible that Epiphanius may only have had access to one final work by Porphyry in which Celsus and Philosabbatius are also associated with this criticism, or he could have connected the dots to align these three with this particular criticism from any number of sources—particularly if he had the numerous ecclesiastical rebuttals of these critics at his disposal.<sup>22</sup> However, I shall argue later that Eusebius' work, *Gospel Questions and Answers*, is the

---

13–18. Harnack includes this criticism recorded by Epiphanius as Fragment 15 in his catalogue of Porphyry's fragments. A. von Harnack, *Porphyrius 'Gegen die Christen'* 15 *Bücher: Zeugnisse, Fragmente, und Referate, Abhandlungen der königlichen preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil-hist. Klasse* (Berlin, 1916), 49.

20 Barnes, 'Porphyry,' 424–442.

21 See J.W. Hargis, *Against the Christians: The Rise of Early Anti-Christian Polemic*, Patristic Studies Vol. 1 (New York: Peter Lang, 1999), 67ff.

22 Cf. John G. Cook, *The Interpretation of the New Testament in Greco-Roman Paganism, Studien und Texte zu Antike Christentum* 3 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 137–8.

ultimate source of Epiphanius' information, not an independent work by one of these critics.<sup>23</sup>

### 6.3.3 *The Valentinians*

Epiphanius also devotes a sizeable portion of his account of the *Alogi* to the refutation of the Valentinian Gnostics (*Haer.* 51.23.1–28.3). He notes that they believed that Jesus lived for thirty years, which they then used to support their belief in thirty divine Aeons, or first principles. In response to this error, Epiphanius meticulously goes through the list of consulships in order to prove that Jesus actually suffered death in his thirty-third year in order to disprove their erroneous account (*Haer.* 51.22.24–23.2). However, as with the criticism of Porphyry, Celsus and Philosabbatius, this excursus has no direct relevance to the criticisms of the *Alogi*.

He does not accuse the Valentinians of criticizing the four Gospels, nor does he insinuate that the *Alogi* had anything to do with this Gnostic group. Rather, in his attempt to rebut the second objection of the *Alogi* concerning the number of Passovers Jesus observed during his ministry, Epiphanius launches into a long exposition on the chronology of the life of Christ (*Haer.* 51.22.1–30), beginning with the year of his birth and concluding with the year of his death. By the time he reaches the end of this chronological study he has shifted his focus from a refutation of the criticisms of the *Alogi* against the Gospel of John to his dismissal of the views of the Valentinians (cf. *Haer.* 51.28.3–4).

Although he does not explicitly accuse the Valentinians of criticizing the compatibility of the Gospels, it is clear that Epiphanius finds them guilty of this charge. He states that if they had paid attention to the Gospel of Luke (3:23), when it states that Jesus began his ministry when he was about to be thirty years old, then they would have known that their views were wrong (*Haer.* 51.24.6). They also failed to understand what was meant by the 'acceptable year of the Lord'. If they had read the other Gospels (esp. Lk. 4:18–19), they would have known it was not the last year of Jesus' life, but rather 'a year without opposition' at the beginning of his ministry (*Haer.* 51.25.1, 51.27.4, 51.28.2). Thus, although there is no direct connection between the Valentinians and the *Alogi*, Epiphanius includes this argument because they too are guilty of not understanding and appropriating the authority of all four Gospels.

### 6.3.4 *Other Criticisms of the Gospels*

There were, of course, other critics of early Christianity that employed much the same form of criticism as those noted by Epiphanius. Although Epiphanius

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Chapter 9.4.

does not mention these other critics in his account of the *Alogi*, they are nevertheless part of the historical context that demonstrates the broad concerns over the four-fold Gospel in the lead-up to the *Panarion*. For example, in the *Dialogue of Adamantius* 1.7 one can find criticisms put forward by the later Marcionites that the Gospels are far from harmonious. In Epiphanius' own day, Julian the Apostate, the last Roman emperor of the Constantinian dynasty in the fourth century, was well known for his own condemnation of Christianity by means of pointing out in particular the chronological discrepancies of the Gospels.<sup>24</sup> Similar arguments come from Hierocles of Bithynia in the early fourth century (Eusebius, *Contra Hieroclem*).<sup>25</sup> Thus, the issues surrounding the four Gospels that originated in the second-century continued well into the time of Epiphanius and after.

Indeed, one can see throughout various testimonies of the early Fathers that the problem of the one Gospel message articulated in four separate Gospels, which differ at various points in content and form, was a self-evident issue that required attention. And although Epiphanius' account of the *Alogi* is billed as his response to criticisms against the Johannine Gospel and Apocalypse, the majority of his comments reflect his broader concerns regarding the compatibility and integrity of the four-fold Gospel. His aim, therefore, is not only to defend the Gospel of John, but the entire Gospel canon.

### 6.3.5 *Attempts at a Solution to the Problem of Gospel Incompatibility and the 'Orthodox' Response*

There were, in effect, three methods of responding to the issues surrounding the various difficulties of a four-fold Gospel.<sup>26</sup> First there were attempts to reduce the number of Gospels. For example, Marcion opted for only one gospel—abandoning all but a redacted, Paulinized form of Luke. Despite the swift denunciation by the early Church Fathers against Marcion and his gospel, it did not eradicate the desire for a singular gospel text. It merely took a different tack, from radical reduction to synthesis.

Here one finds Tatian, who created his *Diatessaron* (διὰ τεσσάρων; *HE* 4.29.6; *Haer.* 46.1.8–9) as a singular harmony of the four. One can only speculate as to his motivation. Perhaps it was a reaction to Marcion's gospel,<sup>27</sup> or in response

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Merkel, *Widersprüche*, 19–23.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 18–19. See also T.D. Barnes, 'Sossianus Hierocles and the Antecedents of the "Great Persecution"', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 80 (1976): 239–52. Barnes follows Harnack in dating this work some time before 303 AD.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Campenhausen, *Formation*, 170–1.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 175; cf. Perrin, 'Diatessaron,' 311.



to the apparent discrepancies between the four.<sup>28</sup> Perhaps it was intended for liturgical purposes.<sup>29</sup> Some have argued that Justin Martyr, at one time Tatian's mentor, probably paved the way for Tatian's work with his own harmonized version of at least Matthew, Mark, and Luke (and probably John).<sup>30</sup> Provided this is true, either Tatian used Justin's harmony, or it is possible that both were reliant on the same, earlier, harmonized gospel form.<sup>31</sup>

Subsequent to Tatian's work there were other attempts at Gospel harmonization. We know from Jerome (*Ep. ad Algasiam* 121.6) that Theophilus 'joined

28 Baarda, *Διαφώνια*, 25.

29 The *Diatessaron* was certainly used for liturgical purposes in the East in the fourth century where the *Doctrine of Addai* notes that Christians assembled to read the Old and New Testaments and the *Diatessaron*. See G. Phillips (ed.), *The Doctrine of Addai the Apostle* (London: Trübner and Co., 1876), fol. 23a, 34, cited in Carmel McCarthy (ed.), *Saint Ephrem's Commentary on Tatian's Diatessaron: An English Translation of Chester Beatty Syriac MS 709 with Introduction and Notes*. *Journal of Semitic Studies Supplement* 2. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 5–6.

30 E.g. H. Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament: History and Literature of Early Christianity* Vol. 2 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982), 342–3, though Koester excludes the Gospel of John in Justin's harmony; Campenhausen, *Formation*, 174; Petersen, 27–9; cf. J.R. Harris, *The Diatessaron of Tatian: A Preliminary Study* (London: C.J. Clay and Sons, 1890), 54; Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 20. Whether or not Justin knew the Gospel of John and employed it is the subject of much scrutiny. Regarding the question of why no clear citations of the Fourth Gospel are found in Justin's writings, Hillmer (70–80) argued, 'The best explanation is probably that Justin refused to use John because it was popular among the Valentinians in Rome... while Tatian, who shows much more sympathy for the teachings of these gnostics, could readily accept and use this gospel.' However, more than a century ago E. Abbot made a compelling case (now largely forgotten) for Justin's knowledge of (and use of) the Fourth Gospel. See E. Abbot, 'The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel: External Evidences,' in *The Fourth Gospel and its Authorship* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1892), 16–76. Also, more recent investigations have called into question the general belief that Justin was at best reticent of the Fourth Gospel. The analysis of Stanton ('Fourfold Gospel,' 330–1) is particularly compelling, especially his argument that Justin's *Dial.* 103.8 demonstrates that he accepts at least four Gospels, and due to the fact that there is no clear evidence he accepted any other gospels than the canonical four, we may presume he had in mind Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. He thinks Justin may have collected and harmonized clusters of the sayings of Jesus for catechetical purposes, but *not* as a replacement for the four-fold Gospel (332). Others who agree that Justin knew the Fourth Gospel include, C.E. Hill, 'Was John's Gospel among Justin's *Apostolic Memoirs*,' in *Justin Martyr and His Worlds*, eds. Sara Parvis and Paul Foster (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 88–94; Perrin, 'Diatessaron,' 313–14; Hengel, *Johannine Question*, 13.

31 Harris titled this hypothesized text 'Pre-Tatian' and suggested this was the source of both Justin and Tatian. See Harris, *Diatessaron*, 54–56. See also Petersen, *Tatian's Diatessaron*, 28.



together in one work the words of the four Gospels.<sup>32</sup> Another example is found in Ammonius of Alexandria, whom Eusebius says composed his own '*Diatessaron*' (*Ep. ad Carpianum* 1).<sup>33</sup> The *Gospel According to the Ebionites*, from which Epiphanius quotes in his rebuttal of the group by the same name (cf. *Haer.* 30.13.1–14.5), may also fall into the category of a Synoptic harmony.<sup>34</sup> The pull towards a singular harmonized Gospel was a logical, attractive and, one might argue, natural solution to the problem of the Gospel disharmony. For others, it was misguided. The textual creation of a singular *Diatessaron* came at a cost that was deemed unacceptable to others within the early church. Although based on 'authentic' texts, such harmonies were new, artificial constructions that perhaps stood too close in proximity to the forgeries of Marcion and the Valentinian *Gospel of Truth*. It was, by nature of its redacted form, a gospel that reflected the work of the editor more than the apostolic foundations of the original Gospel texts.

Thirdly, there were those who argued that all four gospels are inspired accounts of the life and ministry of Jesus, which carry apostolic authority; therefore all four should be accepted. Irenaeus is the first extant witness to explicitly state the necessity of a four-fold Gospel canon. As he famously argued, there can be no more, no fewer than these four (*AH* 3.11.8–9). His argument for accepting all four gospels was carried forward and enhanced by other prominent writers in the early church such as Origen, Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius of Caesarea, Augustine and others.

Some scholars have argued that the emergence of arguments for a four-fold Gospel was a reactionary position in order to combat the views of Marcion and the Valentinians.<sup>35</sup> G.M. Hahneman agrees, arguing that Irenaeus' well-known notice, 'must have been something of an innovation, for if a Fourfold Gospel had been established and generally acknowledged, then Irenaeus would not have offered such a tortured insistence on its numerical legitimacy.'<sup>36</sup> Furthermore, E. Pagels argues that Irenaeus rescued John's Gospel from the

32 'Theophilus Antiochenae... qui quattuor evangelistarum in unum opus dicta compingens...' Text in J. Labourt (ed.), *Saint Jérôme, Lettres*, tome VII (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1961), 30.

33 See Petersen, *Tatian's Diatessaron*, 32–4, 37–8. The Greek text of *Eusebii Epistula ad Carpianum et Canones 1–x* is conveniently located in Nestle-Aland's *Novum Testamentum Graece* ed. xxvii (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft), 84–5.

34 See Petersen, *Tatian's Diatessaron*, 29–31.

35 Cf. Campenhausen, *Formation*, 164ff.; J. Knox, *Marcion and the New Testament: An Essay in the Early History of the Canon* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942).

36 Hahneman, 101.

clutches of the Gnostics by welding it to 'the far more widely quoted Gospels of Matthew and Luke.'<sup>37</sup>

Here again we see a variety of compelling and dramatic interpretations of what happened; yet, there is another plausible explanation. As noted throughout history by scholars such as Harnack, Zahn, Hengel, Stanton, and others, it may have been the case that there was an earlier conception of a four-fold Gospel. In this case the emergence of the four was not as a reactionary position, but a process of gradual acceptance that began prior to Marcion's 'Gospel'.<sup>38</sup>

37 E. Pagels, *Beyond Belief: The Secret Gospel of Thomas* (New York: Random House, 2003), 112.

38 It has been argued that Marcion's Gospel together with his corpus of ten modified letters of Paul (the 'Apostolikon') represented the earliest known 'New Testament canon', though caution should be exercised in presuming alongside Campenhausen and Knox that the development of the canon within the Church was a heavily reactionary position. See Campenhausen, *Formation*, 148ff.; and the full text of Knox, *Marcion*. To be sure, this view has shaped many of the present views of canon formation, but in his important work, *The Arch-Heretic Marcion*. WUNT 250 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), Sebastian Moll has reframed the issue in light of Marcion's own view of canon. He states, 'Marcion was surely not the first Christian to consider certain texts as authoritative. If at all, he was the first to *limit* the number of these texts' (103). Moll concludes, 'we could still maintain that Marcion can legitimately be called the founder of the first Christian 'authoritative collection of books', and he proceeds to offer the following analysis, which cuts straight to the core of the issue: 'In order to establish a corpus of Scripture the Church as well as Marcion had to reach a point at which they considered themselves to be in a posterior age compared to the *Urgemeinde*. Once this deliberate distinction had been made, they began to see themselves no longer as the 'producers' of Scripture, but merely as its interpreters' (104). Of course, in the whole discussion of the formation of a 'canon' this happened much earlier for Marcion than it did for the Church, because Marcion believed the original texts had reached a point in which they were becoming falsified and thus he attempted to re-establish the originals. In challenging the prevailing paradigm of Marcion based on the works of Harnack, Moll has also reshaped the discussion of Marcion's role in the canon formation, though Harnack and Moll share some common ground on this issue. Here see Harnack, *Marcion, The Gospel of the Alien God*, trans. John E. Steely and Lyle D. Bierma (Durham, N.C.: Labyrinth Press, 1990), translated from the original: *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott. Eine Monographie zur Geschichte der Grundlegung der katholischen Kirche* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1921). Moll is quick to note, however, that the exact process of orthodox canon making is not the main focus of his study, but his insights provide a valuable contribution to the issue. Other scholars have challenged the Campenhausen/Knox paradigm, including the studies of M. Hengel, who argues that Marcion's 'canon' was not the impetus for the creation of the catholic New Testament, but that it expedited the process of an implicit acceptance of a four Gospel canon that can be traced to a period before Marcion. See further, Hengel, *Four Gospels*, esp. 32 and 229–30, n. 131; Stanton, 'Fourfold Gospel', esp. 336ff.; and the recent work by

I shall argue later that it is likely that early in the second century, Papias of Hierapolis knew of all four Gospels and recorded the story of their origins—thus providing a pre-Marcion account of the canonical four.<sup>39</sup>

Yet, the appeals by such writers did not address the specific issues with which the bishop of Cyprus was concerned in his account of the *Alogi*. Their concerns appear to be much broader. Irenaeus, it is true, provides a defense and explanation of the quadriform Gospel; indeed, he actually *celebrates* the fact that there are four versions with a single theological unity (*AH* 3.11).<sup>40</sup> But he is not responding to any specific criticism for their incompatibility. Among various early Church Fathers there was particular interest in the subject of the different beginnings of each of the Gospels. The issue of the different genealogical accounts in Matthew and Luke prompted Julius Africanus to pen an epistle to Aristides in which he sought to resolve the discrepancies by showing how the two accounts are actually in agreement (*Ep. ad Aristidem*; cf. *HE* 1.7, 6.31.3).<sup>41</sup> There is also an attempt to explain the 'different beginnings' of all four gospels in the *Muratorian Fragment* as well. Tertullian brushes aside the issue of variations amongst the beginnings of the Gospels in his polemic against Marcion (*Adv. Marc.* 4.2). The different beginnings of the Gospels are also a prominent feature in Epiphanius' testimony of the *Alogi* as well, but his attention is devoted to the more specific criticisms that were not addressed by his predecessors.

### Summary

In light of this historical context, it is apparent that the account of the *Alogi* is primarily Epiphanius' own attempt at reconciling the four gospels, which is couched in his response to the criticisms of the *Alogi*. Prior to Epiphanius there were a number of different solutions to the differences between the

---

Hill, *Who Chose the Gospels?* It is important not to overlook the landmark works of A. von Harnack, *The Origin of the New Testament and the Most Important Consequences of the New Creation* (London and New York, 1925), 69–72; and Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* 1, 153. Both of these still provide excellent positions that run counter to the later views of Campenhausen and Knox. See also the important insights of Metzger, *Canon*, 90–9, and esp. 282, where he distinguishes between 'canon' as a 'collection of authoritative books' and 'an authoritative collection of books'.

39 Cf. Chapter 9.1.

40 See Stanton, 'Fourfold Gospel,' 320–1; also Merkel, *Widersprüche*, 42–3.

41 The Greek text of the *Epistle ad Aristidem* along with a German translation is provided by Merkel, *Plurität*, 50–7.

gospels, many of which arose sharply in the second century. The debt that Epiphanius owes to those that came before him will become clearer in the following chapters. Yet, whereas many of his predecessors focused on the problem of accepting multiple gospels or the different beginnings of the gospels, Epiphanius goes much further in recording other, *specific* objections that were not treated in the writings of those that came before him. It is also notable that his testimony is much broader than simply a record of the objections of the *Alogi* against the Johannine corpus, for he records various criticisms regarding the integrity and authenticity of the four-fold Gospel that do not directly fit with the way in which he describes the *Alogi*. Although he accuses the *Alogi* of attributing the Gospel and Apocalypse of John to Cerinthus, Cerinthus himself emerges as a target of refutation throughout this testimony. The same is true for the Ebionites, Valentinians, Celsus, Porphyry and Philosabbatius—all of which do not fit the mould Epiphanius casts for the *Alogi*, but who are nevertheless included in his testimony because they are guilty in one way or another of rejecting the integrity and compatibility of the gospels.

Having established the broader context in which Epiphanius describes the *Alogi*, the focus now shifts to the way in which he uses the testimonies of earlier Church Fathers in the construction of this heresy.

### SECTION 3

#### *The Sources of Epiphanius' Account of the Alogi*





## Epiphanius' Use of Papias and Irenaeus

The earliest identifiable source in Epiphanius' account of the *Alogi* is that of Papias of Hierapolis, whose early tradition of the origins of the Gospels originated towards the beginning of the second century. This tradition is also visible in the writings of Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, and others. The extant information on Papias and his writings comes only through the information provided by later writers. Irenaeus states that Papias was 'a hearer of John, companion of Polycarp and a man of old time,' who wrote five books (*AH* 5.33.4; cf. *HE* 3.36.1–2, 3.39.1). The identity of this 'John' is unclear and the subject of much scrutiny, as Papias' account mentions two Johns: John the apostle and John the elder (*HE* 3.39.4). Nevertheless, this testimony, in addition to other fragments that suggest Papias' work belongs in the time of Hadrian, is central to the common dating of Papias in or around the first quarter of the second-century.<sup>1</sup>

### 7.1 Papias on the Origins of the Four Gospels

Irenaeus preserves aspects of Papias' eschatological views (*AH* 5.33.4), but he does not mention Papias' name in association with his testimony of the origins of the Gospels (at least Matthew and Mark; *AH* 3.1.1) for which Papias is best known, even though similarities between the two suggest that he is borrowing from Papias' account. Eusebius, in contrast, does attribute to Papias the well-known account of the origins of the Gospels, at least those of Matthew

<sup>1</sup> E.g. Philip of Side (5th cent.) records that Papias mentions those who Jesus raised from the dead surviving to the time of Hadrian (117–38 AD). See frg. 16 in J. Kürzinger, *Papias von Hierapolis und die Evangelien des Neuen Testaments* (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1983), 166–7 = frg. 5 in J.B. Lightfoot and J.R. Harmer (eds.), *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. Revised by Michael W. Holmes (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998), 317–18. For more, see Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 13–14; Campenhausen, *Formation*, 129ff. See also frg. 4 in Kürzinger; cf. also frgs. 10–11 in Lightfoot, Harmer and Holmes for additional information pertaining to Papias' dates. However, see the recent argument for a later dating of Papias and questions regarding whether he knew of a four-gospel canon by E. Norelli, 'Papias de Hiérapolis a-t-il utilisé un recueil 'canonique' des quatre évangiles?' in G. Aragione, E. Junod and E. Norelli (eds.) *Le canon du Nouveau Testament: Regards nouveaux sur l'histoire de sa formation*. Le monde de la Bible 54 (Geneva: Labor et Fides 2005), 35–85.

and Mark. According to Eusebius, Papias himself claims not to have known any of the apostles directly (*HE* 3.39.2–4). Nevertheless, Papias was determined to ‘examine closely the words of the elders—what Andrew or what Peter said, or what Philip, or what Thomas or James, or John or Matthew or the other of the Lord’s disciples, and whatever Aristion and the Elder John, the disciples of the Lord, said’ (*HE* 3.39.4). Such a record would be of untold value, but unfortunately Eusebius chose only to preserve fragments of the tradition that Papias collected from those who knew the apostles. The most common explanation for Eusebius’ scanty citations of Papias is that the former had a low estimation of the latter, describing him as a man with a ‘very small mind’ (σφόδρα μικρὸς τὸν νοῦν) because of his chiliastic views (*HE* 3.39.12–13) with which Eusebius took strong exception.

Despite his disdain for Papias, Eusebius does manage to preserve his tradition of the origins of the Gospels of Matthew and Mark. In *HE* 3.39.15–17 Eusebius cites Papias as follows:

(15) And this the presbyter said: ‘Mark, who, becoming Peter’s interpreter, wrote down exactly everything he remembered, however not in order, the things said or done by Christ. For he neither heard the Lord nor followed him, but later, as I said, he followed Peter, who adapted his teachings as necessary but had no intention of making an ordered account of the sayings of the Lord. So neither Mark did do anything wrong in writing down some things as he remembered them, for he made one purpose: not to leave out anything that he heard or to make some false statement in them.’ These, then, are the accounts by Papias concerning Mark. (16) But regarding Matthew he said: ‘Thus, Matthew arranged the sayings in the Hebrew language and each person interpreted them as they were able.’ (17a) He [also] used testimonies from the first epistle of John and also from that of Peter.<sup>2</sup>

These are the words of Papias, but it is important to note that he is relaying the tradition that was told to him by others, in this case the presbyter.<sup>3</sup>

The essential information on the origins of Matthew and Mark found in the testimony of Papias was to be repeated by numerous subsequent Church Fathers, including Epiphanius who maintains the notice that Matthew wrote his account in Hebrew (*Haer.* 51.5.3) and that Mark’s Gospel is a product of

2 GCS 2,1 *Eusebius Werke*, 290–2.

3 Cf. C.E. Hill, *From the Lost Teaching of Polycarp: Identifying Irenaeus’ Apostolic Presbyter and Author of Ad Dionnetum*. WUNT 186 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 33.



his relationship with Peter (*Haer.* 51.6.10). Epiphanius does not claim to know Papias' work first-hand. Thus, this information is likely mediated by a later writer who was reliant upon this tradition—perhaps Irenaeus or Eusebius.

However, Eusebius does not explicitly mention any record from Papias on the Gospels of Luke and John, which raises the question whether or not Papias knew them. If he did, and if he spoke of their origins, why does Eusebius not record what he has to say? Despite Eusebius' silence, many have argued that there is good reason to believe Papias did know these Gospels. Regarding the Fourth Gospel in particular, some scholars have argued that Papias' sequence of the apostles listed above (*HE* 3.39.4) does not reflect the Synoptic order, but rather that of John. As Hengel notes, 'the affinities between the sequence of disciples in John 1.35–51, the list in John 21.2 and in Papias are striking and certainly no coincidence.'<sup>4</sup> Opinions such as that of Hengel have been around since the time of J.B. Lightfoot and more recently in the works of R. Bauckham, R.A. Culpepper, G. Stanton and C.E. Hill—each providing additional evidence to suggest that Papias knew the Gospel of John.<sup>5</sup>

One consideration is the mention of 1 John, which points to the likelihood of Papias' knowledge of the Fourth Gospel for at least two reasons: (i) as Lightfoot argued, 1 John was written not only at or around the same time as the Gospel of John, but it was also probably attached to it;<sup>6</sup> also, (ii) Papias may have mentioned the first epistle of John to corroborate the Gospel by the same author, much the same way as he does with 1 Peter and Mark's Gospel.<sup>7</sup> As to why Eusebius would not include Papias' information on the Gospel of John, Hengel may be right in noting the possibility that 'Eusebius sometimes concealed information which seemed disagreeable to him or omitted it through carelessness.'<sup>8</sup> Yet there is another explanation that is more likely.

4 Hengel, *Johannine Question*, 17–18, also p. 155, n. 101. Also, Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays*, 69.

5 Hengel, *Johannine Question*, 17–23; Lawlor, 'Eusebius on Papias,' *Hermathena* 19 (1922): 167–222, esp. 202, n. 1; Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays*, 63–70; R. Bauckham, 'Papias and Polycrates,' 24–69; *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 225–6; Stanton, 'Fourfold Gospel,' 333; C.E. Hill, 'What Papias Said about John (and Luke): A "New" Papian Fragment,' *JTS* 49 (1998): 582–629; 'The Orthodox Gospel': The Reception of John in the Great Church Prior to Irenaeus.' In *The Legacy of John: Second-Century Reception of the Fourth Gospel*. Ed. Tuomas Rasimus, 233–300. *NovTSupp* 132 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 285ff.; Culpepper, *John*, 111–12. For an opposing view, see Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy*, 204–5.

6 Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays*, 63.

7 This presumes that the passages are 1 Peter 5:13 and 1 John 1:1–4. See Bauckham, 'Papias,' 47, 55. Bauckham was preceded in this notion by J.B. Lightfoot, *Essays on the Work entitled Supernatural Religion* (London: Macmillan, 1889), 206. See also Hill, 'What Papias Said,' 594.

8 Hengel, *Johannine Question*, 21.

Hill has argued that Eusebius' record of the origins of the Gospels of John in *HE* 3.24.5–13 actually masks what is the tradition of Papias, and that Eusebius simply did not attribute it to him.<sup>9</sup> As I shall argue in Chapter 9, this is partially true, but it is far more nuanced and much more significant than Hill realizes. If it is true that Papias is behind Eusebius' statements here (*HE* 3.24.5–13) then the tradition of Papias is foundational to Epiphanius' refutation of the *Alogi*.

## 7.2 Irenaeus and the Four-Fold Gospel

Any thorough discussion surrounding the use of, or opposition to, the Gospel of John in the early church is inevitably tied to the testimony of Irenaeus of Lyons. Irenaeus is the earliest Church Father to explicitly pronounce the Gospel of John as an accepted work and he quotes from it extensively in his refutation of the heresies. His argument for the necessity of a four-fold Gospel is well known, particularly as it represents the earliest extant argument for a closed Gospel canon that comprises only those of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. For Irenaeus, any attempt to reduce or expand the four-fold Gospel is misguided: 'It is not possible,' he states, 'that the Gospels can be either more or fewer than they are' (*AH* 3.11.8). Irenaeus' conclusion for the necessity of a four-fold Gospel is the capstone of a methodical, measured, and unique theological argument for the recognition of these four books as the authoritative, inspired, 'scriptural'<sup>10</sup> foundation of the orthodox Rule of Truth (cf. *AH* 2.35.4, 3.9–11).

Irenaeus (*AH* 3.11.8) notes the different beginnings of the Gospels; yet, rather than provide an explanation or apology for the differences found in the beginnings of the Gospels, Irenaeus cleverly converts the issue of four different Gospels from a liability to an asset. Lightfoot puts it well: 'He ransacks heaven and earth for reasons why the evangelical record should thus be foursquared.'<sup>11</sup> This 'ransacking' includes the fact that there are four zones in the world, four principal winds, four faces of the cherubim (Ez. 11–21, 10:20), four living creatures (Rev. 4:7), the four-fold activity of the Word of God, and four covenants that God made with mankind.<sup>12</sup> All of these points reflect the theological unity of the Word's dispensation of the quadriform Gospel (τετραμόρφον εὐαγγέλιον),

9 Hill, 'What Papias Said,' 582–269.

10 'Irenaeus, so far as we can tell, was the first catholic theologian who dared to adopt the Marcionite principle of a new "scripture" in order to use it in his turn against Marcion and all heretics.' Campenhausen, *Formation*, 186.

11 Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays*, 78.

12 See T.C. Skeat, 'Irenaeus and the Four-Gospel Canon,' *NovT* 34, no. 2 (1992): 194–199.

held together by the Spirit (AH 3.11.8).<sup>13</sup> Rather than being contradictory, Irenaeus sees the four Gospels as enunciating the different characteristics of Jesus' life and ministry. John begins by displaying Jesus' original, powerful, and glorious generation from the Father. The beginning of Luke shows the priestly character of Christ while Matthew relates His generation as a man. Finally, Mark shows the prophetic aspect.

When one turns to Epiphanius' response to the objections to the Gospel of John by the *Alogi*, there is clear evidence of Irenaeus' testimony (AH 3.1.1) in which traces of Papias' testimony are also readily apparent. Both Irenaeus and Epiphanius note that Matthew wrote his Gospel first among the Hebrews in their language (ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν; cf. *Haer.* 51.5.3). Next, Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, handed down the Gospel that Peter had preached (cf. *Haer.* 6.10). In his account (AH 3.1.1) Irenaeus adds the story of the origins of the Gospels of Luke and John that is not found in Papias' notice in HE 3.39, but it does appear in the text of Epiphanius. Luke, the companion of Paul, issued the Gospel taught by Paul (cf. *Haer.* 51.11.6), and finally John published his Gospel during his time in Ephesus in Asia (cf. *Haer.* 51.2.3–4, 51.12.2).

Irenaeus' tradition of the origins of the four Gospels was surely influenced by Papias' account of the origins of the Gospels of Matthew and Mark (HE 3.39),<sup>14</sup> and quite possibly the Gospels of Luke and John as well, presuming Papias said as much. This tradition was to become well known, repeated and expanded elsewhere.<sup>15</sup> There are definite parallels between Epiphanius and Irenaeus concerning their accounts of the origins of the Gospels, but there is also much more.

### 7.3 Irenaeus' Testimony as the Foundation of the *Alogi*

Subsequent to his argument detailing the validity and necessity of these four Gospels, Irenaeus attacks those who 'destroy' this quadriform Gospel. He notes that some see the need for more Gospels, while others want fewer. Two groups are readily predictable: the Valentinians claim that their *Gospel of Truth* is on par with those of the apostles, and Marcion only accepts a dissected form of

13 See Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 10; Campenhausen, *Formation*, 195. Cf. Merkel, *Widersprüche*, 42–3. On the strength of this argument in an historical context, see G. Stanton, 'The Fourfold Gospel,' *New Testament Studies* 43.3 (1997), 319ff.

14 Cf. Hengel, *Johannine Question*, 3. On Irenaeus' use of Papias, see Chapman, 15–16; Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays*, 67–8.

15 Hill, 'What Papias Said,' 585. Cf. Bauckham, 'Papias,' 63ff.

the Gospel of Luke (*AH* 3.11.9; cf. 1.27.2–4). Irenaeus then mentions another anonymous group, who reject the Paraclete and therefore must also reject the Gospel of John. This notice is important for a number of reasons; not least of which is that it is a foundational element of Epiphanius' *Alogi*.

Others (*Alii*), indeed, in order to frustrate the gift of the Spirit, which in the most recent times—according to the pleasure of the Father—was poured out on the human race, do not admit that appearance in the Gospel of John, where the Lord promised that he would send the Paraclete; but they reject both the Gospel and the prophetic Spirit. Wretched men indeed, who want to be false prophets, they in fact reject the prophetic grace from the Church, just like those who—on account of those who come in hypocrisy—also abstain from communion with the brethren. I understand, moreover, that those of this kind (also) do not accept the Apostle Paul; for in that epistle which is to the Corinthians, prophetic gifts are mentioned, and he (Paul) knows men and women prophesying in the Church. Sinning against the Spirit of God in all these things, therefore, they fall into the irremissible sin (*Mt.* 12:32; *AH* 3.11.9).<sup>16</sup>

Epiphanius makes a nearly identical statement in his final description of the *Alogi*. In his closing remarks, Epiphanius has this to say:

But since these people have not received the Holy Spirit they are judged for not observing the things of the Spirit, and being willing to speak against the words of the Spirit. They do not see the gifts of grace in the holy Church, which, with understanding and a sound mind, the Holy Spirit set out in detail, so also the holy apostles, and the holy prophets have followed truly and vigorously. Among these, St. John has given his gracious gift to the holy church, through the Gospel, the Epistles and Revelation. But as it is said, 'He who blasphemes against the Holy Spirit, it will not be forgiven him, neither in this age nor in the one to come.' (*Mt.* 12:32) For they have also waged war against the words spoken by the Spirit (*Haer.* 51.35.1–3).<sup>17</sup>

16 Latin text from A. Rousseau, *Irénée de Lyon: Contre les Hérésies*, Livre III. SC 211 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1974), 170–2.

17 *GCS* 31,2 *Epiphanius II*, 310–11.

When one compares these two testimonies it is clear that what Irenaeus says in *AH* 3.11.9 is the platform upon which Epiphanius constructs his *Alogi*. The crime and the punishment are identical—so also is the structure and sentiment.<sup>18</sup>

Epiphanius' <i>Alogi</i> ( <i>Haer.</i> 51.35.1–3)	Irenaeus' <i>Alii</i> ( <i>AH</i> 3.11.9)
(I.a) Have not received the Holy Spirit	(I.b) Frustrate the gift of the Spirit
(II.a) Do not know the gifts of grace in the holy Church	(II.b) Repel the gift of grace from the Church
(III.a) These are the gifts that the holy apostles and prophets have expounded	(III.b) Paul writes about prophetic gifts; (cf. <i>AH</i> 3.1.1–2, 3.6.1–5, 3.17.1)
(IV.a) John shared his holy gift through his Gospel, Epistles and Revelation.	(IV.b) According to the Gospel of John God promised the Paraclete
(V.a) They are guilty of the irremissible sin (Matt. 12:32)	(V.b) They are guilty of the irremissible sin (Matt. 12:32)

The parallels between these two testimonies are too striking to deny that Epiphanius derived this portion of his testimony from anyone other than Irenaeus.<sup>19</sup> It is a well-known fact that Irenaeus does not record anything else about his anonymous group whereas Epiphanius attributes criticisms and other unique features to the *Alogi*.

Numerous scholars have suggested that the '*Alii*' of *AH* 3.11.9 refers to a group of anti-Montanists, who wanted to do away with the Fourth Gospel because it was in this Gospel that the 'prophetic Spirit' is promised.<sup>20</sup> The question as to whether Irenaeus is referring to the issue of Montanism in *AH* 3.11.9 is significant. First, it is far from certain that Irenaeus intended this group to reflect anti-Montanists, for he does not mention the New Prophecy at all in his treatise.<sup>21</sup> There is also some confusion as to the viability of dating Irenaeus'

18 Cf. Bludau, 168.

19 See Bardy, 358; Hill, *Johannine Corpus*, 187. I find no reason to agree with Smith ('Gaius,' 254) that this could have been mediated through Hippolytus' lost work against Gaius; such a view is pure conjecture.

20 Culpepper, 121; R.E. Heine, 'The Gospel of John and the Montanist Debate at Rome,' 99; Smith, 'Gaius,' 254–5; Campenhausen, *Formation*, 238–9, n. 159; Fisher, 2; Streeter, 438–9.

21 For Irenaeus' 'wait and see' attitude towards the New Prophecy, see Campenhausen, *Formation*, 232; Labriolle, *Crise*, 231ff.

comments with the progression of Montanism. Eusebius notes that the Montanism 'outbreak' (καινοτομηθείσης) occurred during the reign of Marcus Aurelius, sometime in the decade of 170 AD (*HE* 4.27).<sup>22</sup> Epiphanius offers a much earlier date in the nineteenth year of Antoninus Pius, around 156–7 AD (*Haer.* 48.1.2), but Eusebius' dating is more generally accepted.<sup>23</sup> If Eusebius' account is right, then the New Prophecy emerged within the same decade as Irenaeus' *Adversus Haereses*, meaning he *might* have known of the New Prophecy. His later comments about false prophets and those who pretend to utter prophecies under the influence of a false spirit could reflect his own questions about it (*AH* 4.33.6–7).<sup>24</sup> Also, he *might* have known about ecclesiastical backlash to the New Prophecy, but this conclusion should be proffered cautiously. Anti-Montanism is not the only possible explanation. Shortly after the time of Irenaeus there was a trend to disallow *any* prophecy in the church. True prophecy was a thing of the past, a feature of the apostolic era. In this passage, Irenaeus may have been responding to those who advocated such a view of prophecy, not necessarily the New Prophecy and the ecclesiastical response to it. The fact remains that Irenaeus is not forthcoming, and the tendency to see the anti-Montanist Gaius of Rome lurking behind his statements is unnecessary.

Did Epiphanius indicate that the *Alogi* were anti-Montanists? Neither his testimony that borrows from Irenaeus nor his entire defense of the Gospel of John suggests he interpreted Irenaeus' notice in *AH* 3.11.9 or the *Alogi*'s attacks on the Gospel of John as having anything to do with Montanism. If he did, one would expect to find some trace of the issue of the New Prophecy either in the objections to the Gospel of John or in his rebuttal. There is, however, nothing of the sort.<sup>25</sup> He also is silent about any anti-Johannine rhetoric in his own refutation of the Montanists (*Haer.* 48). Thus, regardless of whether or not Irenaeus is referring to a group of anti-Montanists, there is no indication in Epiphanius' testimony that he conceives of the *Alogi* as being such.

The critical difference between Irenaeus and Epiphanius is the reversal of the elements that are rejected. For Irenaeus, the rejection of the Spirit is what

22 For the complexities surrounding the dates of Montanism, see esp. T.D. Barnes, 'The Chronology of Montanism,' *JTS* n/s, 21 (1970), 403–8; also Cerrato, 204.

23 Barnes ('Chronology,' 406) argues convincingly against Epiphanius' dating. See also Powell, 'Tertullianists and Cataphrygians,' 34 and Labriolle, *Crise*, 461ff.

24 Cf. Valée, 34.

25 Brent, *Hippolytus*, 143: 'the absence of a specific anti-Montanist polemic on the part of the Ἀλογοί is likewise evident. There is no discussion of the Paraclete passages nor of *Jn.* 21, and the relationship between charisma and Order.'

leads to the rejection of the Gospel of John wherein the Paraclete is promised. In contrast, Epiphanius inverts this relationship. This is an important point that is almost universally overlooked; for Epiphanius, it is the rejection of the Gospel of John that is tantamount to the rejection of the Spirit, which inspired the apostles who authored the Gospels. Nowhere does Epiphanius indicate that the Spirit is the target of this group's disdain, as is found in Irenaeus.

Epiphanius' take on Irenaeus' testimony bears striking similarities to some modern interpretations. This notice is overwhelmingly, and wrongly, interpreted as an anonymous group having formally rejected the Fourth Gospel. But a closer look at this passage reveals that this is not what Irenaeus intends at all. Rather, he is accusing this group of rejecting that aspect of John's Gospel *in qua Paracletum se missurum Dominus promisit*. Allen Brent has noted this as well. 'Irenaeus does not therefore claim that they reject the Fourth Gospel itself but only that in rejecting the Spirit as Paraclete they are indirectly rejecting that Gospel which they might indeed have formally accepted whilst being oblivious to the contradictions in such a position.'<sup>26</sup> Irenaeus makes this abundantly clear in the following lines, where he indicts these anonymous critics for 'repelling the prophetic grace from the Church' (*propheticam uero gratiam repellunt ab Ecclesia*). He also goes on to state that such persons must also reject Paul, for he too speaks of prophecy. But in the same way that Irenaeus does not formally state that they reject the Pauline corpus, his focus is not on the rejection of these books themselves; the issue is the rejection of the Spirit that logically necessitates such a rejection of John and Paul.

Moreover, the fact that this group is guilty of blaspheming the Holy Spirit—the irremissible sin—is further evidence that this group's crime is against the Paraclete, not necessarily the Gospel of John. Irenaeus offers a similar notice in his later work, *Demonstration of Apostolic Preaching* (99), where he mentions the same group that 'do not receive the gifts of the Holy Spirit and drive away the prophetic grace from the Church.'<sup>27</sup> Yet here Irenaeus makes no mention at all of the Gospel of John being at stake, rather it is the gifts of the Holy Spirit that are rejected, and the grace of prophecy that is repudiated. If there had existed a group within early Christianity that formally rejected the Fourth Gospel, Irenaeus would undoubtedly have had more to say than this brief gloss. While it is enticing to interpret Irenaeus' notice in *AH* 3.11.9 this way,

26 Ibid., 139. See also Hengel (*Four Gospels*, 21), who rightly notes that this criticism is directed against the Paraclete.

27 *Alii autem dona Spiritus sancti non recipiunt et abiciunt a seipsis charisma propheticum*. Adelin Rousseau, *Irénée de Lyon, Démonstration de la Prédication Apostolique*. sc 406 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1995), 218.



the fairest reading of the evidence suggests that Irenaeus did not intend John's Gospel to be viewed as a volatile component of his four-fold Gospel canon.

Perhaps Epiphanius could be accused of garbling the reading of *AH* 3.11.9, but if so he would not be alone. In fact, this passage has been interpreted many different ways, and it remains the subject of much scrutiny. Before Epiphanius is rendered incompetent, as he often is, it is easy to see where he would have picked up his own way of thinking about the Gospel and the Spirit in the writings of Irenaeus. For example, immediately after this notice, Irenaeus goes on to refer to the Spirit as that which appeared at Pentecost and dwelt within the apostles as they went out to preach the Gospel (*AH* 3.12). He also states that the apostles preached the Gospel because they were endowed with the Holy Spirit (*AH* 3.1.1; cf. 3.24.1). Moreover, in his argument for the necessity of a four-fold Gospel, he emphasizes the fact that this τετράμορφον . . . εὐαγγέλιον is divinely willed to be 'held together by one Spirit' (*AH* 3.11.8).<sup>28</sup> Thus, the role of the Spirit as understood and articulated repeatedly<sup>29</sup> by Epiphanius in his defense against the attacks of the *Alogi* is also intimated in Irenaeus; but, for Epiphanius, these *Alogi* do not understand the role of the Spirit, and as a result of rejecting the Gospel of John they commit the sin of blaspheming the Spirit (*Haer.* 51.35.1–3).

### 7.3.1 *Cerinthus and the Ebionites in Irenaeus and Epiphanius*

Epiphanius also borrows from Irenaeus (*AH* 3.11.1) in his introduction, where he states that John was impelled by the Holy Spirit to correct the teachings of Cerinthus and others (*Haer.* 51.2.3, 51.4.1–2, 51.12.3). As with Irenaeus (*AH* 1.26.1–2), Epiphanius associates Ebion with Cerinthus, both in his account of the *Alogi* (*Haer.* 51.2.3, 51.10.4, 51.12.3) and in his account of the Ebionites (e.g. *Haer.* 30.1.3, 30.3.7, 30.14.1). His knowledge concerning the similarity between the Ebionites and Cerinthus most likely came from Irenaeus (*AH* 1.26.2), though it is possible he could have used Hippolytus (*Ref.* 7.22), who follows Irenaeus closely.<sup>30</sup> Elsewhere in the *Panarion*, Epiphanius repeats Irenaeus' notice that the Ebionites have similar beliefs as Cerinthus: both believe that Jesus was fleshly and not born of a virgin and that Christ was the spiritual form that came to Jesus in the form of a dove at his baptism (*Haer.* 30.16.3).

Yet it must be said that at times Epiphanius leaves little room to doubt the fact that he *does* garble Irenaeus' account. For example, in his chapter on the

28 See esp. Fr. gr. 11 of *AH* 3.11.8 in SC 211, 162.

29 (*Haer.* 51.4.11; cf. 51.6.2, 5, 11–12; 51.9.1; 51.12.2; 51.16.9; 51.20.5; 51.21.14).

30 Later writers, also indebted to Irenaeus, make this connection as well (e.g. Victorinus in *Apoc.* 11.1; Jerome *De vir. ill.* 9; Monarchian Prologue).



Ebionites (*Haer.* 30), Epiphanius recounts the story of St. John encountering Ebion in the baths in Asia, at which time John cried out that they should all leave lest the bath fall and bury them with Ebion inside (*Haer.* 30.24.1–5). This story originates with Polycarp and is recounted by Irenaeus (*AH* 3.3.4; cf. *HE* 3.28.6), only it was not Ebion, but Cerinthus in the baths. He also attributes characteristics that Irenaeus gives only to the Ebionites and transfers them to Cerinthus, such as the fact that Cerinthus only used the Gospel of Matthew (*Haer.* 28.5.1, 28.7.4; cf. 30.14.2) and rejected Paul (*Haer.* 28.5.3).<sup>31</sup> It is, at least in part, because Hippolytus does not link Matthew with either of these groups that suggests Epiphanius' source is more likely Irenaeus.

#### 7.4 Irenaeus and the Second Objection to the Gospel of John

The second objection of the *Alogi* focuses on the apparent discrepancy between the number of Passovers during Jesus' ministry that are recorded in John's Gospel as compared to the number in the Synoptics. Here again one can detect traces of Irenaeus, though it is clear that Epiphanius does not always agree with what he had to say. In particular, Hill is right to note that in his response to the second objection against the Gospel of John, Epiphanius provides a corrective to what he perceives to be an erroneous position of Irenaeus concerning the views of the Valentinian Gnostics.<sup>32</sup>

In *AH* 2.22, Irenaeus attacks the Valentinian claim that the thirty Aeons in their godhead correspond to the thirty years of Christ's life. In his attempt to overturn this false correlation, Irenaeus argues that they do not correctly understand the 'acceptable year of the Lord' (Is. 61:2), which the Valentinians believed was the twelve month period of Jesus' ministry after his baptism (*AH* 2.22.1; 1.3.3) and the final year of his life.<sup>33</sup> In contrast, Irenaeus argues that the 'acceptable year of the Lord' was the entire period of time in which men heard and believed the preaching of the Gospel (*AH* 2.22.2). To disprove their belief that Jesus only preached one year and died at the age of thirty, Irenaeus refers to the three Passovers recorded in the Gospel of John before stating the obvious: these three Passovers did not all happen in one year.

31 Although Irenaeus mentions Cerinthus in the same passage as the Ebionites, he only attributes these qualities to the latter (*AH* 1.26.2).

32 Hill, *Johannine Corpus*, 187–8. Smith ('Gaius,' 382) suggests this is simply an 'unrelated discussion' that only has a 'tangential relationship' to the real arguments against the Johannine literature by the *Alogi*.

33 So also was the view of Clement of Alexandria *Strom.* 1.21.

Perhaps this would have been sufficient to refute the Valentinians, but he goes on to make the rather befuddling assertion that the Gospel of John and the tradition from Asia Minor prove that Jesus lived for more than fifty years, and thus the entire system of the Gnostic Aeons is proven to be false, 'for the period between the thirtieth and fiftieth year could never be regarded as one year' (*AH* 2.22.5–6; cf. John 8:56–57). 'How is it possible,' Irenaeus asks, 'that the Lord only preached for one year?' (*AH* 2.22.3). Irenaeus is mistaken, and Epiphanius, it turns out, has the answer.

Epiphanius overturns Irenaeus' bizarre defense that Jesus died as a pentagenarian and that the period of Jesus' ministry identified as the 'acceptable year of the Lord' (*AH* 2.22.2) lasted for much longer than one year. Epiphanius is careful to note that the 'acceptable year of the Lord' is, in fact, 'a year without opposition' (*Haer.* 51.25.1, 51.27.4, 51.28.2). Furthermore, after providing a list of thirty consulships to demonstrate the accurate year of Christ's suffering, Epiphanius states:

For who has numbered the successive consulships, which cannot be mistaken, and not think contemptuously about those who customarily hold that there is a discrepancy in the number of years which is given by the evangelists? For, because of this, it is also the downfall of the earlier Valentinian heresy and some others with their fictitious recordings of the thirty Aeons they thought they could compare the years of the Savior's life, in order to make it possible for them to record the story of their Aeons and first principles. For one finds that it is the thirty-third year of his incarnation that the Only Begotten suffered (*Haer.* 51.23.2–4a).<sup>34</sup>

Epiphanius then expounds on his long and tedious chronological proof, providing the dates of Christ's birth, ministry and death and numbers the Passovers during Jesus' ministry at three (*Haer.* 51.24.1–51.27.6). Following this excursus, he returns to his refutation of the Valentinians and his correction of Irenaeus' argument. 'First, Valentinus is put to shame as a dramatist since he expects (to prove) to us that there are thirty Aeons from the years of the Savior's childhood leading up to his time as a man. He does not realize that [he] did not live for only thirty years' (*Haer.* 51.28.1). Epiphanius then states that Jesus was baptized when he was 'twenty-nine years and ten months,' and that 'all the years of his incarnation, from his birth until his passion totalled thirty-two years and seventy-four days;' thus 'Valentinus is refuted, and the many others who are just as foolish' (*Haer.* 51.28.2–3).

34 GCS 31,2 *Epiphanius II*, 291–2.

It is certifiable that Epiphanius knows of Irenaeus' witness concerning the Valentinians, for he quotes all eleven chapters of Book I of *Against Heresies* that describe the Valentinian Gnostics (*Haer.* 31.9.1–31.32.9).<sup>35</sup> He also refers to some of Irenaeus' refutations, which happen to be found in the chapters surrounding the argument for Christ living into his fifties.<sup>36</sup> Epiphanius even heralds the work of Irenaeus along with Hippolytus and Clement in refuting the Valentinians when he states, 'I have no wish to add to the work . . . since these men satisfy me and my intent is precisely the same' (*Haer.* 31.33.3). He promises that he will not mention the Valentinians any longer (*Haer.* 31.36.2), but of course this is not true for he is not fully satisfied with Irenaeus' refutation of the Valentinians.

The fact that both Irenaeus and Epiphanius tie together the issue of the number of Passovers to the argument against the Valentinians demonstrates that Epiphanius knew and used Irenaeus' testimony. Yet Irenaeus' argument is clearly mistaken, and so Epiphanius was compelled to use John's Gospel to correct this erroneous teaching that Jesus was in his fifties when he died and thus the correlation between the number of Aeons and Jesus' death is false (*AH* 2.22.5; John 8:56–57). Moreover, Epiphanius does not agree with Irenaeus' number of Passovers that Jesus celebrated or that the 'acceptable year of the Lord' lasted any longer than the first year of Jesus' ministry—a year without opposition.

If Epiphanius is engaged with the testimony of Irenaeus, why does he not mention Irenaeus' name? It very well could be the case, as Hill suggests, that he omits a reference to Irenaeus because he disagreed with his interpretation.<sup>37</sup> Yet it is worth recognizing the fact that Epiphanius draws on the testimony of Irenaeus repeatedly throughout his account of the *Alogi* without mentioning his name.<sup>38</sup> In fact, Epiphanius is known for pillaging previous materials without always identifying his sources.

Furthermore, one may wish to consider another point made by Hill, that the Valentinian controversy was a 'precursor to that of those who reject John's Gospel, partly because of bad chronology.'<sup>39</sup> This is theoretically possible, but the evidence is beginning to mount in favor of looking past the testimony of the *Alogi* as historical fact, and instead seeing it as a conflation of various

35 Cf. Williams, *Panarion* I, xxvi: '[W]hen discussing the Valentinians and their relatives [Epiphanius] depends on him (Irenaeus) entirely.'

36 E.g. *Haer.* 31.35.4=*AH* 2.20.2, cf. *AH.* 1.3.3; *Haer.* 31.35.6=*AH* 2.23.1, cf. *AH* 2.20.1.

37 Hill, *Johannine Corpus*, 187, n. 56.

38 See Kim, 263.

39 Hill, *Johannine Corpus*, 188.

issues that Epiphanius brings together into a single category. This will become even clearer as consideration is given to Epiphanius' use of other early Church Fathers.

### Summary

There are traces of the earlier testimonies from Papias and Irenaeus that are detectable in the testimony of Epiphanius' *Alogi*. If Epiphanius is manufacturing a composite heresy, it is easy to see how the testimonies of these two writers—particularly Irenaeus—were elements in the way Epiphanius went about collecting the pieces for his portrayal of the *Alogi*. Not only is the testimony of Irenaeus visible in the way in which Epiphanius describes the *Alogi* both in the introduction and conclusion, it is also evident throughout the rest of Epiphanius' testimony as well, such as Irenaeus' account of the origins of the Gospels as well as the second objection of the *Alogi* against the Gospel of John.

## Epiphanius' Use of Origen

Origen is the earliest extant Christian writer to claim that the chronology of Jesus' ministry recorded in the Gospel of John cannot be harmonized with that found in the Synoptics. Throughout the tenth book of his *Commentary on John*, he cites lengthy portions of all four gospels in order to highlight points of conflict that would eventually lead him to question their historical veracity, and yet the issues he raises do not culminate in dissuading him from accepting the authority of the gospels. Rather, he maintains Papias' tradition of the four gospels; however, in doing so he must wrestle with finding harmony amidst their differences and contradictions. His proposed solution is found in his hermeneutic: he interprets the gospels spiritually, or allegorically, rather than viewing them as representing a precise history.

The conflict between the Gospel of John and the Synoptics is, of course, the primary concern of the *Alogi* as well. Scholars have often noted similarities between Origen's analysis of the discrepancies amongst the gospels and the criticisms of the *Alogi*. The question arises whether or not there was an individual or group lurking behind these accusations, one which prompted Irenaeus' defence of John's gospel, inspired Origen's comments, and earned the ire of Epiphanius. In the first part of this work I argued that the usual culprit in this scenario, Gaius of Rome, has been unjustly accused. The link between this early anti-Montanist and Origen is therefore broken, thereby welcoming a reassessment of the connections between Origen and the criticisms of the *Alogi*.

### 8.1 Origen on the Authority of the Gospels

Prior to discussing Origen's concerns with the reliability and compatibility of the four gospels it is important to recognize that he clearly accepts their authority. Comments taken from his commentaries on Matthew and John, as well as the fragments of his *Homilies on Luke* demonstrate that his account of the origins of the four gospels is very much in line with the tradition that had developed before him.

Eusebius preserves portions of the first book of Origen's *Commentary on Matthew* (HE 6.25.3–6) that indicates the latter only acknowledges (εἰδέναι)

four gospels.<sup>1</sup> They are ‘the only indisputable ones in the Church of God under heaven.’ In what may be an echo of Papias, Origen states that he ‘learned by tradition’ (ἐν παραδόσει μαθὼν) that Matthew wrote his gospel first in the Hebrew dialect (γράφμασιν Ἑβραϊκοῖς συντεταγμένον) after which Mark was wrote a gospel as Peter taught. Likewise, Origen notes that Peter refers to Mark as his son in his first Epistle. Luke’s gospel was third, written for Gentile converts and commended by Paul after which came the Gospel of John. Whether or not Origen learned this tradition directly from Papias’ writings or an intermediary, the parallels between Origen’s account and this tradition of the order of the gospels and the details of their formation are self-evident.

Eusebius continues to present Origen’s views of scripture by citing his *Commentary on John*, which affirms the authenticity of the Pauline epistles and First Peter (HE 6.25.7–10). Origen has doubts about the second epistle of Peter, but he is adamant that the writings of John include a gospel, the Apocalypse, and at least one authentic letter. He takes the same view in his *Homilies on Luke*,<sup>2</sup> stating that the church has four gospels and the heretics have many, but only four are approved (*Hom. Luc.* 1.2). The gospels attributed to Thomas and Matthias are therefore out. His concern reflected in all of these statements is *not* whether or not to reduce the number of accepted gospels, but to brush off attempts at multiplying them unnecessarily. Thus his argument—at least at this stage—is not technical but traditional. The church has claimed her four gospels and Origen complies.

In another fragment Origen has this to say about the Gospel of John: ‘There is a written record that John gathered the written gospels during his lifetime under the reign of Nero. He approved and recognized those that the devil’s lies had not tainted, but he rejected and excluded those that he saw as not being truthful.’<sup>3</sup> What was Origen’s source for this information? Clement of Alexandria is a possibility, for he states that John knew the Synoptics and, having perceived that the ‘external facts’ (τὰ σωματικὰ.) had been made plain in these gospels, proceeded to write his own ‘spiritual’ (πνευματικὸν) gospel (HE 6.14.7). Origen made similar claims (cf. πνευματικῶς . . . σωματικῶς; *Comm. Jo.* 10.4). However, Clement also notes that his information is derived from

1 This is the only extant fragment of this portion of the text.

2 *Comm. Matt.* 16.9 mentions *Hom. Luc.* 34. For the date of the *Homilies*, see J.T. Lienhard (trans.), *Origen: Homilies on Luke* (Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1996), xxiv.

3 Greek in Fr. 4—Ra 9 in H. Crouzel, F. Fournier and P. Périchon (eds.), *Origène Homélie sur S. Luc, Texte Latin et Fragments Grecs de M. Rauer* (G.C.S.), sc 87 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1998), 466.

the 'earliest presbyters' (ἀνεκαθεν πρεσβυτέρων; *HE* 6.14.5), implying that this tradition had been around for some time. Similarly, Eusebius attributes to an unspecified source a similar account of John collecting and verifying earlier gospels (*HE* 3.24.7). That this original record most likely came from Papias will be discussed in the following chapter.

This brief survey demonstrates that Origen falls in step with the growing tradition that there are and can only be four gospels; however, he cannot escape the fact that there are concerns that must be addressed if he is to maintain this view. Most notably, the discrepancies among the gospels give Origen pause in affirming their historical reliability. It is here that Origen takes a step into previously uncharted territory by addressing the conspicuous discrepancies in the chronologies of Jesus' life and ministry as portrayed in the four gospels. This is a shift from the earlier concerns over the different beginnings of the gospels towards a critical examination of the four gospels as different (and differing) records of the singular gospel message. The specifics of his concerns over various gospel discrepancies are detailed further below. First, however, it is important to recognize how Origen used these issues to showcase the need for a spiritual or allegorical exegesis of Scripture. Origen's suggestion that the gospels do not cohere and his resulting appeal for allegorical interpretation of scripture were anathema to Epiphanius.

## 8.2 Origen and Epiphanius: Differing Hermeneutical Paradigms

For Origen, the apparent disagreements in the gospels do not negate their truth, nor do they diminish the fact that Scripture is harmonious and perfect. Just as a musical chord is comprised of distinct notes to create a coherent sound, so also are the various points of disharmony in Scriptures. However, he who is instructed in the music of God can bring together different points in Scripture into harmonious chords that demonstrate the totality of Scripture is the instrument of God (cf. *Comm. Matt.* 2 = *Philocalia* 6.1–2). The Law, Prophets, gospels, and Apostolic writings are therefore demonstrated to be in complete harmony through the work of the skilled exegete, the blessed peacemaker of whom Jesus spoke at the Sermon on the Mount (Mt. 5:9).<sup>4</sup>

Thus, the tensions between the Gospel of John and the Synoptic Gospels do not make the former inferior in any way; in fact Origen has the highest regard for the Fourth Gospel. For him, all scripture is gospel, the four gospels

4 Ignatius of Antioch makes a similar statement concerning the way that the bishop and the presbyters in the church of Ephesus are in harmony as with strings on a harp (Ign. *Eph.* 4.1).

themselves are the 'first fruits of scripture' (*Comm. Jo.* 1.5), and the Gospel of John is the first fruits of the gospels (*Comm. Jo.* 1.6). As to their content, the gospel writers tried to present the truth both 'spiritually and historically' (πνευματικῶς ἅμα καὶ σωματικῶς; *Comm. Jo.* 10.4), but this was not always possible. If there are historical differences, Origen finds no reason for condemnation, for such instances serve to convey the underlying 'spiritual' meaning.

Although the finer points of Origen's hermeneutical approach to Scripture are subject to a variety of opinions, the fourth book of Origen's *On First Principles* offers a general and broadly representative portrait of his methodology. He notes that in Proverbs Solomon commands that the divine doctrines should be recorded in a threefold manner. In the same way that man consists of body, soul, and spirit, Scripture is given the same three senses (literal, moral and spiritual) for mankind's salvation.<sup>5</sup> Thus, Scripture has three senses in which it may be interpreted, although in practice he tends to emphasize only two: the spiritual and the literal.<sup>6</sup> Yet, a strictly literal exegesis can lead to error, as seen in such use of Scripture by Basilides, Valentinus, and even Satan at Jesus' temptation (*Hom. Luc.* 31.2–3). Likewise, Christians with a limited education who interpret Scripture only in a literal sense are prone to ignorant claims and false opinions (*De Prin.* 4.2.4). In his response to Celsus' charge that Christians lack intellectual rigor, he concedes that few Christians have devoted themselves to serious, devoted study of Scripture (*C. Cels.* 6.37). Origen labels such believers the 'simple ones' (*simpliciores*).<sup>7</sup>

Origen was certainly not 'simple', and yet his appeal for allegorical interpretation of scripture did serve a simple purpose. It was his attempt to maintain the divine integrity of the Scriptures. He could have gone the way of Marcion or Tatian and tampered with the text to make the pieces fit together more snugly, and, to be sure, at times he felt the liberty to suggest minor modifications. But Origen's alterations were mere tweaks when compared to these other editorial overhauls. Revising the text was not his standard practice. Rather, in response to the problems created by literal interpretation and apparent textual discrep-

5 Origen's hermeneutical approach is covered in detail by R.P.C. Hanson, *Allegory and Event: A Study of the Sources and Significance of Origen's Interpretation of Scripture* (London: SCM Press, 1959). For an excellent assessment of Origen's hermeneutic from a biographical perspective, see Peter Martens, *Origen and Scripture: The Contours of the Exegetical Life*. Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012). See also Michael W. Holmes, 'Origen and the Inerrancy of Scripture,' *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 24/3 (Sept. 1981), 221–31, esp. 226.

6 See Hanson, *Allegory and Event*, 233ff.

7 Martens, 27.



ancies, he issued what Peter Martens has dubbed the 'Educational Mandate' to engage Scripture from a well-rounded education and firm grasp of philosophical thinking.<sup>8</sup> From this approach, it is clear that the purpose of Holy Scripture is not simply to be understood literally, particularly since some of the things it says are not factually true (*De Prin.* 4.3.4). In fact there are various instances where the gospels preserve a 'spiritual truth' in the outward form that some may say is 'a lie' (*Comm. Jo.* 10.5).<sup>9</sup>

Yet the allegorical exegesis is not merely a tool to be used to make sense of points in Scripture that are seemingly incompatible. In response to one of Celsus' attacks that Scripture cannot be interpreted allegorically, Origen points to the Apostle Paul's spiritual interpretation of various Old Testament passages (*C. Cels.* 4.49). Elsewhere he argues that it is the spiritual interpretation of the Law, as taught by Paul, that allows the 'disciples of Christ' to properly understand its meaning in a way that differs from the mistaken, literal exegesis of the 'disciples of the Synagogue' (*Hom. Ex.* 5.1).<sup>10</sup> If the Apostle Paul approaches Scripture this way, why should we not follow his lead?

Not everyone would agree with this method of interpretation. Even some of Origen's supporters balked at adopting his hermeneutical perspective indiscriminately. A notable example of this is Eusebius, who once collaborated with Pamphilus to write a lengthy defense of Origen; but, as I shall argue in the following chapter, he also counteracted Origen's views concerning the incompatibility of the four gospels through his own explanation of apparent historical differences (cf. *HE* 3.24.5–13). However, if the subtlety with which Eusebius challenged certain aspects of Origen's thinking reflects his respect for Origen's philosophical acumen and theological mind, then Epiphanius' criticisms and flagrant harassment of Origen indicate his smug disdain for the former Alexandrian bishop and his followers.

Epiphanius could not stomach Origen's approach to Scripture that welcomed philosophy and allegory as viable exegetical tools. For Epiphanius, philosophy and classical *paideia* warranted no place in Christian theology. In fact, he claims all heresy can be traced to their origins in Greek philosophy and mythology (*Haer.* 26.16.7), and he dedicates much of the first quarter of the *Panarion* to make this point painfully clear. He viewed Origen as the clearest example of the inherent dangers of such formal education. It was this point in particular that he emphasized to John of Jerusalem in a half-hearted letter of apology for circumventing John's authority and ordaining an anti-Origenist

8 Ibid., 28–33.

9 Cf. Holmes, 'Origen,' 228.

10 Martens, 158–9.

priest in his jurisdiction. Epiphanius claims that the votaries of all eighty heresies have at least one point in common with Origen: they all draw from the pure well of Scripture but ignore the original sense in which it was written in favour of exegesis that twists Scripture according to their own desires. Origen tampers with 'the true meaning of the narrative' by means of his 'false use of allegory', eventually distorting scripture to the point where he 'makes them mean what they do not mean at all' (Jerome, *Ep.* 51.4).<sup>11</sup>

In the *Panarion*, Epiphanius informs the reader that the source of Origen's errors is the bite he suffered from the wicked serpent, which is worldly education (*κοσμικῆς προπαίδειας*; *Haer.* 64.72.5). This explains his poisonous attempts to comingle Holy Scripture with pagan philosophy: 'And you also, Origen, blinded by your Greek education, have spewed venom for your followers and you have become poisonous food for them—damaging many people with the poison through which you yourself have been damaged' (*Haer.* 64.72.9).<sup>12</sup> It is not that Epiphanius wanted to separate philosophy and *paideia* from scripture, as though they might have their proper place outside the realm of theology. Rather, because heresy was directly tied to classical culture, it had to be completely eradicated.<sup>13</sup> It was Origen's wealth of learning that eventually led to his downfall (*Haer.* 64.3.8).

Epiphanius therefore found it unnecessary to be skilled in rhetoric or philosophy in order to prove the authority of Scripture. Epiphanius received *some* formal education, but he admits to caring little for the rhetorical arts, and more so for the spiritual health of those who would read his works (*Haer.* 31.35.1). His concern was not for the intellectual elite, but the common man. Thus, he would have worn Jerome's notice that many 'normal people' read the works of Epiphanius (*De vir. ill.* 114) as a badge of honor.

For Epiphanius, divinely inspired Scripture itself attests to the fact that its description of historical events is accurate and literally true. However, this does not necessarily mean, that he was a strict literalist, as some have sug-

11 For more on Epiphanius' criticisms of Origen's allegorical exegesis, see Elizabeth A. Clark, *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 86–105.

12 Cf. Dechow, 15.

13 The work of Young R. Kim has shed new light on how Epiphanius' background and theology influenced his writings and perspective of the world. Kim offers a compelling alternative to the common scholarly portrayal of Epiphanius as an inept historian and intellectual lightweight. For more on Epiphanius' rejection of classical culture, see Kim, 'Reading the *Panarion* as Collective Biography: The Heresiarch as Unholy Man,' *vc* 64 (2010), 382–413.

gested. Such an either-or paradigm does not adequately reflect the nuances of the different exegetical approaches of his time.<sup>14</sup>

In fact, Epiphanius uses allegorical exegesis throughout his writings. The *Panarion* itself is structured on his allegorical interpretation of *Song of Songs* 6:8–9, 'There are sixty queens and eighty concubines, and virgins without number. My dove, my undefiled is but one' (*Haer.* 35.3.5–6). Of course, Epiphanius sees the dove as the true bride of Christ, the church. He also interprets the 'virgins without number' as philosophies that have no ties to the Lord whatsoever, and Solomon's eighty concubines as the total number of heresies—all of which claim to bear the name of Christ but do not properly belong to him (*Haer.* Proem 1.4.2). As to his exegesis of the sixty queens, Epiphanius even greater liberties with the text. For him they represent the generations of Adam to Christ, only he has to fudge the numbers to make it work (*De Fide* 4.1–5.4). Another Epiphanian work, *On Weights and Measures*, aims to explain the significance of all the weights, measures, and numbers in scripture. 'Measures are worthy of spiritual contemplation for those who understand' (*De Mens.* 30). Thus, for example, the three measures of flour with which Sara made cakes (Gen. 18:6) is clearly a reference to the Trinity (*De Mens.* 30).

Epiphanius' unique exegetical approach to scripture reflects well the seemingly self-contradictory complexities of Epiphanius himself. On the one hand, his education and moments of lucid analysis and precise thinking do not quite fit the mold of the *simpliciores* that Origen belittled as incapable of delving into the deeper questions of God and Scripture. Although it may not be found on every page of his works, there is enough evidence throughout his writings to demonstrate that he is capable of profundity of thought. On the other hand his conviction that all scripture is written by the Holy Spirit is a rather simple premise that guides his firm conviction that the 'truth speaks in plain words' (*Haer.* 35.3.2). This is the root of Epiphanius' disdain towards Origen's hermeneutic: Origen has gone beyond 'the true drift of the passages' of scripture (Jerome *Ep.* 51.5). For Epiphanius, there is some room for allegorical interpretation of scripture, but spiritual understanding does not come at the expense of historical truth. 'But all of the holy words do not need to be bound to allegories

14 Recent studies have shown that the traditional Alexandria vs. Antioch model of allegorical vs. literal exegesis (respectively) does not do justice to the evidence. See Ayres, *Nicaea and Its Legacy*, esp. 31–40; Frances Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002); John O'Keefe, 'A Letter that Killeth: Toward a Reassessment of Antiochene Exegesis,' *J ECS*, 8 (2000): 83–104. For Epiphanius' hermeneutical method in particular, see esp. Andrew Jacobs, 'Epiphanius of Salamis and the Antiquarian's Bible,' *J ECS* 21 (2013): 437–64.

for their meaning; they require inspection and the perception to comprehend the power of each principle. Yet tradition must be used as well, for not everything from the sacred scripture can be grasped' (*Haer.* 61.6.4–5).<sup>15</sup>

Despite their glaring differences, there are some common points between Epiphanius and Origen. Most notably, Epiphanius is not adverse to allegorical interpretation; in fact he uses it quite freely and without apology at various points in his writings. Both wanted essentially the same thing: to demonstrate the unity of Scripture. Their goal is identical; it is the approach that separates them. Origen's high standards for true exegesis and appeals to allegorize the text did not resonate with Epiphanius whose concern it was to safeguard the right to the truth—especially *historical* truth—through the reading of Scripture by the common man.<sup>16</sup>

### 8.3 Origen and the Discrepancies Among the Gospels

In the tenth book of his *Commentary on John*, Origen's 'mortally dangerous' exegesis is in clear view when he questions the historical veracity of some of the events recorded in the gospels. He begins by questioning the historicity of Jesus cleansing the Temple (which he later denies in favour of its spiritual significance). This story is the second act of Jesus in John's Gospel while the gospels of Matthew and Luke situate it as part of the Passion narrative, thus suggesting that it never happened (*Comm. Jo.* 10.15–16). The differences are so great that he claims it is impossible to harmonize these accounts.

In his following comments, Origen moves on to other problems of incompatibility with John's account of Jesus' actions before and after the cleansing of the Temple—namely, Jesus' temptation and his first trip to Capernaum. Here again, he finds that John's record contradicts the other gospels. In *Comm. Jo.* 10.2 he issues an ultimatum:

If the discrepancy between the gospels is not solved, it is necessary to abandon our trust in them as being truthful and written by a divine Spirit, or as credible records, for these characteristics are said to belong to these works. For they say—those who accept the four gospels (οἱ παραδεχόμενοι τὰ τέσσαρα εὐαγγέλια), and who suppose that the discrepancy (διαφωνίαν) is not to be resolved through anagogical interpretation (διὰ τῆς ἀναγωγῆς)—they will have to explain the difficulty

15 Cf. Merkel, *Widersprüche*, 172.

16 Cf. Lewis Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 83.

noted beforehand, about the forty days of the temptation, a period for which there is no room that can be found in the account of John, (and) when the Lord came into Capernaum . . . But if we ask when Christ was in Capernaum the first time, they will say to us, according to the words of Matthew and the other two, it was after the temptation, when 'leaving Nazareth He came and stayed in Capernaum next to the sea.' But how can they claim both the account of Matthew and Mark be true—that it was on account of Him hearing that John was delivered up that he withdrew into Galilee—and that according to John, [which states that] after a number of other events than just His stay at Capernaum (namely His going up to Jerusalem and His journey from there to Judea) that John was not yet cast into prison, but was baptizing in the Aenon near Salim? And there are many other points where, if someone carefully scrutinizes the gospels concerning their historical disagreement (τὰ εὐαγγέλια περὶ τῆς κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν ἀσυμφωνίας)—we will try to present each as they happen, insofar as we are able—he will surely become dizzy and will either shrink from confirming the gospels as true, and choose one of them at random since he would not dare to deny completely the faith concerning our Lord, or accept that there are four <and inquire> that their truth is not to be found in the outward characteristics (σωματικοῖς χαρακτῆρσιν; *Comm. Jo.* 10.2).<sup>17</sup>

Origen offers compelling evidence to support his view that spiritual interpretation offers a solution to this dilemma that, when interpreted literally, would show that scripture is not trustworthy. To clarify his point, he poses a hypothetical situation in which multiple witnesses report the same event but with different, conflicting details. One might say that Jesus was sitting while giving a speech and another may claim that he was standing. Both cannot be factually true, but they may be spiritually important. So it is with John's gospel, which leaves no room for the temptation and confuses the details surrounding Jesus' first trip to Capernaum.

#### 8.4 Origen and the First Criticism of the *Alogi*

Origen's analysis is so close to the first criticism of the *Alogi* such that the two are nearly indistinguishable. Both are concerned with the fact that the Gospel

17 Cécile Blanc, *Origène, Commentaire sur Saint Jean. Tome II (Livres VI et X)*. SC 157 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1970), 386–90.

of John leaves no room for the forty days of the temptation. Bearing in mind Origen's remarks, consider the *Alogi*'s first objection:

(5) For they say against themselves—I do not say against the truth—that [John's] books do not agree (οὐ συμφωνεῖ) with the other apostles'. And now they believe they can attack the holy and inspired teachings. (6) "And what did he say?" he asserts (φησὶν). "In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God and the word was God." And that, "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we knew his glory, glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." (7) And immediately, "John bore witness and cried, saying, 'This is the one of whom I was telling you.'" And that "This is the lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world."

And next [John] says, "And those that heard him said, 'Rabbi, where do you dwell?'" (8) and in the same breath he says, "in the morning Jesus wanted to go into Galilee and found Philip and Jesus said to him, 'Follow me.'" (9) And after a little while he says, "And after three days there was a wedding in Cana of Galilee, and Jesus was called, and his disciples, to the wedding supper, and his mother was there." (10) But the other evangelists say that he spent forty days in the wilderness being tempted by the devil, and then returned to choose his disciples. (11) And they [the *Alogi*] have not seen that each evangelist has taken care to say what the others had said, in agreement with them, while at the same time revealing what each had not proclaimed, but had neglected to disclose. For the will was not their own: but the sequence (ἀκολουθία) and teachings came from the Holy Spirit. (12) If these opponents attack these writings [of John], they must learn that the other three of these [Gospels] did not begin in the same way (*Haer.* 51.4.5–12a).<sup>18</sup>

Although the similarities between Origen's comments and the first objection of the *Alogi* have been noted for a long time, the nature of this relationship has often been underappreciated and misunderstood. Specifically, it is often argued that Gaius of Rome predated Origen as the source for this objection; however, this notion has already been dismissed and further support is provided below. It is sufficient at present to seek alternative sources. With Gaius out of the picture, the focus naturally turns to Origen as Epiphanius' source, as

18 GCS 31,2 *Epiphanius* II, 251–2. Epiphanius also reproduces this objection in slightly different forms at *Haer.* 17.11–18.6 and 51.21.15–17.

Charles Hill has noted.<sup>19</sup> It is true that no other early extant source mentions the specific issue over John's omission of Jesus' temptation, but this singular point of contact, strong as it is, does not necessarily implicate Origen. There is, however, additional evidence that links Origen's comments with this criticism of the *Alogi*.

In addition to John's omission of the temptation narrative, Origen questions the claim that the gospels are divinely inspired and historically credible. To this end, he devotes considerable space throughout the tenth book of his *Commentary on John* to addressing additional discrepancies between John and the Synoptics concerning Jesus' first trip to Capernaum. Specifically, in *Comm. Jo.* 10.2 he asks whether Jesus' trip was because John the Baptist imprisoned, as the Synoptics record, or if John was still baptizing in the Aenon near Salim, as John's Gospel claims. If Epiphanius did in fact use Origen as his source, one should be able to detect additional points of contact with these additional points concerning Jesus' trip to Capernaum. They are clearly not part of the specific objection of the *Alogi*, but Epiphanius does address them in his response, thereby forging a stronger link between Origen and the opinions of the *Alogi*.

#### 8.4.1 *Epiphanius' Response*

Oddly, Epiphanius' first line of defence against the charge of gospel discrepancies is to admit to differences in the gospels. This does not mean, however, that they are incompatible. He points to the different beginnings of all four and provides a lengthy exposition of each (*Haer.* 51.4.11–13.6), tackling various other heretical opinions along the way,<sup>20</sup> before finally addressing the *Alogi*'s argument that John leaves no room for Jesus' temptation. In *Haer.* 51.13.7ff. Epiphanius explains that the apparent confusion is resolved when one sees that John's Gospel is referring to an *additional* trip by Jesus to the Jordan where he encountered John the Baptist. This is why John refers to Jesus' trip in the aorist tense, indicating that John had met Jesus prior: 'This is He of whom I said to you...' (Jn. 1:30); 'John bore witness... saying 'I saw the Spirit'...' (Jn. 1:33). For Epiphanius, this proves that 'John is speaking of two different times as already having happened, in order to point out that this is not the same time as the baptism, but a different one. For Jesus did not immediately go from the temptation to John, but he first went to Galilee and then from Galilee to the Jordan' (*Haer.* 51.13.9–10).

19 Hill, *Johannine Corpus*, 188–9.

20 E.g. the criticisms that he associates with Porphyry, Celsus and Philosabbatius (*Haer.* 51.8.1ff.) as well as the views of Ebion and Cerinthus (*Haer.* 51.12.3ff.).



But Epiphanius has more to say, and his comments align well with the additional concerns of Origen. He repeatedly describes the sequence of events that occurred *after* the temptation (*Haer.* 51.15.1–7, 51.16.1–9, 51.17.2–9, 51.20.1–21.13, 51.21.14–21, 51.30.4–13).<sup>21</sup> One such example of this is found in *Haer.* 51.21.14–21, which is worth reproducing at length:

(14) Heresies like these are overthrown by the truth and accuracy of sacred scriptures, in particular by the harmony of the four gospels. For no one who is thinking correctly would reject the things from the Holy Spirit (which are) given accurately through the sacred gospels. (15) For even though they say (λέγωσιν) that the evangelists Matthew, Mark and Luke set out in detail that the Savior was brought to the desert after the baptism, and that he spent forty days in temptation, and after the temptation heard of John's imprisonment and went to live at Capernaum by the sea—(16) but (they then say) that John is lying (ψεύδεται) because he did not speak about this, but that the Savior immediately came to John (the Baptist), and all the other things he says [Jesus] did. Their complete ignorance of the gospels' precise wording will be made clear. (17) For John the Evangelist makes it known that before the arrest of John the Baptist (and) after the days of the temptation of the Lord, [the Lord] had gone to him <again> (αὐθίς). If John was incarcerated, how did the Savior still return to him at the Jordan? (18) But they also do not know that the other three evangelists give a precise account of the time after John's imprisonment, saying, "But Jesus, hearing that John was cast into prison, leaving Nazareth behind, settled in Capernaum which is upon the seacoast." And you see that everything the four evangelists said is according to the truth and harmonious. (19) For it is clear that John follows the order already laid out clearly [by the Synoptics] when he says that, after performing the Savior's first miracle and having gone to Capernaum and performed some miracles there, and going back to Nazareth and having read the scroll, then afterwards, when John the Baptist was in prison, he went and dwelled in Capernaum for "not many days" (Jn. 2:12). (20) These are the days after the Epiphany, Christ's journey to Capernaum and Nazareth, his pilgrimage to Jerusalem for the Passover, and <his> coming again to John, where he was baptizing at Aenon <near> Salim. (21) For it says, "After this he went down into Capernaum, he and his mother and his brothers, and they remained there not many days" (Jn. 2:12). (He was not yet referring

21 Although Epiphanius' account itself is not entirely harmonious. Here, see Smith, 'Gaius,' 539ff.



to Jesus' final stay [in Capernaum], of which he said later <that> *after* John's imprisonment he was coming to dwell in Capernaum by the sea) (*Haer.* 51.21.14–21).<sup>22</sup>

For his part, Origen demands that those who maintain the view that the gospels are divinely inspired and credible but do not wish to resort to his prescribed analogical interpretation, they must provide an explanation of the missing temptation narrative in John's Gospel *as well as* when the Lord first came to Capernaum. In this defence, Epiphanius provides such a response. Whereas Origen argues that a close examination of the gospels proves their incompatibility, Epiphanius claims that such opinions arise from complete ignorance of the precise wording of the gospels. It must have given Epiphanius great pleasure to claim that he had not only solved this historical dilemma, but also to deprive Origen of his justification for interpreting the gospels by means of his mortally dangerous exegesis. Yet Origen promised to present to the reader the 'many other points' where the gospels disagree with one another, and there is good reason to suggest that one such instance provided Epiphanius with the second criticism of the *Alogi*.

### 8.5 Origen and the Second Criticism of the *Alogi*

Throughout the tenth book of his commentary, Origen delivers on his promise to present other instances of Scriptural incompatibility. For example, the Apostle Paul is not always consistent (10.5), and there are differences in the Gospel accounts of the call of Peter and whether or not Jesus baptized with His disciples (10.6). For Origen, all of these instances point to the need for understanding the greater spiritual truth. Material and historical references do not necessarily refer to material and historical things, but spiritual and intellectual things (10.13). Thus, in John's description of the Passover, Origen asks why John refers to the 'Passover *of the Jews*', which seems redundant (10.11)? Does he include the phrase '*of the Jews*' to differentiate the human, Jewish Passover from the true, divine Passover that is represented by Jesus (as Paul suggests in 1 Cor. 5:7)?

Then, in 10.14–15, Origen addresses another significant discrepancy between John and the Synoptic Gospels. Once again, Origen returns to the events surrounding Jesus' first trip to Capernaum. John's gospel states that while the Lord was there with his mother, brothers, and disciples, the Passover of

<sup>22</sup> GCS 31,2 *Epiphanius* II, 280–1.

the Jews was approaching (Jn. 2:12–17), so He left for Jerusalem and cleansed the Temple. Much later, John's Gospel records a *second* trip, first to Bethany six days before the Passover (Jn. 12:1–8), after which came Jesus' triumphal entry into Jerusalem (Jn. 12:12–15). By contrast, Origen cites lengthy portions of the Synoptic Gospels to demonstrate that they speak of only *one* trip to Jerusalem, where Jesus celebrated the Passover and cleansed the Temple (Mt. 21:1–13; Mk. 11:1–11, 15–17; Lk. 19:29–46). He continues,

I have cited lengthy sections from the gospels, but I think it has been necessary to do so in order to demonstrate the stated discrepancy. Three gospels place these events, which are assumed to be the same as those written by John, as occurring in *one* journey of the Lord to Jerusalem. Yet John places them in connection with *two* visits, which are divided from each other, in between which there were many acts of the Lord and journeys made to other places. Therefore, I find it impossible for those who accept nothing other than the history in their interpretation to admit that these discrepancies are in agreement. And if someone thinks that we have not provided a sound exposition, let him produce an intelligent rebuttal to our view (*Comm. Jo.* 10.15).<sup>23</sup>

When Origen states, 'Three gospels place *these events* . . .' he is clearly including the Passovers, as determined by the preceding context. Charles Hill has noted that this is remarkably similar to the second objection of the *Alogi*:<sup>24</sup>

But they accuse the holy evangelist again, more so the Gospel itself, because, he says (φησὶν), 'John said that the Savior kept two Passovers over a two-year period of time, but the other evangelists describe one Passover' (*Haer.* 51.22.1).<sup>25</sup>

For Hill, 'When Epiphanius cites the second objection of the *Alogi* against John, we seem to hear echoes of Origen's voice.'<sup>26</sup> However, one may rightly protest that Origen's emphasis is on the different locations of the cleansing of the Temple in the gospels.<sup>27</sup> Epiphanius makes no mention of this prob-

23 Emphases mine. SC 157, 464.

24 Hill, *Johannine Corpus*, 189.

25 GCS 31,2 *Epiphanius II*, 283.

26 Hill, *Johannine Corpus*, 190.

27 Although Origen does not emphasize it in the first objection (10.1–2), he does raise the issue of the chronological placement of the cleansing of the Temple there as well.

lem. Perhaps he, like others, simply did not have a ready answer. Even Tatian's *Diatessaron* wholly ignores the Johannine placement of the cleansing of the Temple in preference for the threefold witness of the Synoptics, despite the argument that Tatian preferred the Johannine chronology.<sup>28</sup> Eusebius also ignored this issue in his *Gospel Canons*.

Nevertheless, it must be recognized that Origen does specify that John's gospel mentions two Passovers while the others only refer to one. Furthermore, as seen in the previous chapter, Epiphanius was also concerned with Irenaeus' argument against the Valentinians that there could not have been three Passovers during one 'acceptable year of the Lord'. Although Irenaeus was right to claim the gospels refer to three Passovers (*AH* 2.22.3), he was wrong to claim that 'the acceptable year of the Lord' extended well into Jesus' fifties (*AH* 2.22.5), which would therefore imply additional Passovers. It would seem, therefore, that the combination of Irenaeus' comments with Origen's criticism prompted Epiphanius to address this issue in his account of the *Alogi*. The accusation itself surely belongs to Origen, however, for he alone mentions the two Passovers in John's Gospel and only one in the Synoptics.

Is it a mere coincidence the objections of the *Alogi* parallel Origen's two challenges to those who maintain the gospels are harmonious? In this second criticism we see again Origen's demand that 'If someone thinks that we have not provided a sound exposition, let him produce an intelligent rebuttal to our view' (10.15). In both instances Epiphanius responds to Origen's criticisms and challenges under the guise of the *Alogi*. He later turns the tables by issuing his own challenge to those who follow Origen. After laying out various reasons why Origen should be deemed a heretic, he provokes those who would disagree with *him*, 'But if anyone has a rejoinder to all this, bring it! If someone <wishes> to counteract God, do it!' (*Haer.* 64.70.20).

## 8.6 Origen or Gaius of Rome?

The criticisms of the *Alogi* against the Gospel of John most likely originated with Origen, yet some have argued that Origen is simply recording the same criticisms of Gaius, which he somehow picked up along the way. In addition to the case for exonerating Gaius (Chapter 3), there are a number of reasons why this is improbable.

28 For Tatian's proclivity towards the Johannine chronology in his *Diatessaron*, see Perrin, 'Diatessaron,' 302ff. Cf. Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 227; also Grant, *Earliest Lives*, 23–6, who argues that Tatian did not favor the Johannine order.

First, and most importantly, these issues that Origen mentions in regards to the incompatibility of the narrative of John with that of the Synoptics reflect *his own* views and analysis. He makes similar observations elsewhere, as evidenced in a letter of his to Aristides, where, according to Jerome (*De vir. ill.* 63), Origen devotes much of his attention to the genealogical discrepancies in Matthew and Luke. He also points out other areas of scriptural inconsistency, such as the number of sandals of Jesus that John the Baptist said he was not worthy to untie (*Comm. Jo.* 6.21), and the discrepancies in John's narrative of Jesus' cleansing of the Temple (*Comm. Jo.* 10.15).<sup>29</sup> If the criticisms stated by Origen were views held by another person such as Gaius or a group such as the *Alogi*, it would be natural to expect to find some indication that he cites these issues as belonging to a separate party, as he does in the case of Heracleon's exegesis of the Gospel of John and Celsus' views in his *Contra Celsum*. It is true that Origen was aware of the disharmony of the gospels (e.g. *C. Cels.* 2.27), but evidence of the issue of Gospel discrepancies, particularly the different beginnings, is also attested broadly elsewhere in places such as Irenaeus, the *Muratorian Fragment*, Eusebius, Julius Africanus and others. Indeed, the gospels' disharmony may have been a motivating factor of Tatian's *Diatessaron*. To claim that Origen had acquired privileged information that originated only from Gaius of Rome or a small, otherwise-unattested group known as the *Alogi* is to underestimate the scope of the issue. There is, in fact, no indication in his testimony that he derives these issues from a source, either oral or written, nor do we find any particular notice concerning the discrepancy over the Johannine omission of the temptation in any of the other early Patristic writings.

Secondly, there is the less persuasive argument that Origen was made aware of these criticisms from an encounter with Hippolytus, who would have relayed his opposition to Gaius on these matters.<sup>30</sup> For his part, J.D. Smith concedes that Origen did not have a copy of Hippolytus' lost *Defense* in front of him, thus making this chance meeting the only opportunity for him to learn of the troubles caused by Gaius.<sup>31</sup> Jerome mentions the only known encounter between these two at a Roman church service during the episcopate of Zephyrinus (*De vir. ill.* 61). Jerome learned about this meeting by reading Hippolytus' *On the Praise of our Lord and Savior*, in which the author claims to have been speaking in the presence of Origen. But nothing about Jerome's account the title of this work indicates he discussed Gaius' supposed anti-Johannine rhetoric. It should

29 For more examples and further analysis, see Hanson, *Allegory*, 260ff.

30 Schwartz, 'Über den Tod,' 44/45; Smith, 'Gaius,' 196.

31 Smith, 'Gaius,' 403-4, n. 1.

also be noted that having read this same work, Jerome still felt comfortable including Gaius in his work on *Illustrious Men* (*De vir. ill.* 59). Had Hippolytus' work been a polemic against Gaius and his rejection of the Johannine materials, it is safe to presume Jerome may not have included Gaius' name in this catalogue. Furthermore, Jerome is silent on whether Hippolytus records anything about actually meeting Origen, let alone the content of their exchange. For this argument to work, it is necessary to believe that in their brief time together Hippolytus relayed to Origen Gaius' negative views of the Gospel of John, but there is nothing to indicate that the encounter—if it did actually occur—had anything to do with Gaius.

Even the flimsy evidence that could be construed as supporting this view is not without problems. As Marcovich notes, Jerome mistook Eusebius' notice (*HE* 6.23.1) that Ambrose encouraged Origen to write commentaries on the Scriptures, and suggested that it was *Hippolytus* who made such an appeal (*De vir. ill.* 61).<sup>32</sup> Later writers, including Sophronius, the translator of *De viris illustribus* into Greek, and Photius (*Bibl.* 121), appear to have further misread Jerome's own misreading of Eusebius, when they claim Hippolytus was an imitator of Origen.<sup>33</sup> Photius reverses the direction of influence, claiming that it was actually Hippolytus that demanded so many works of Origen that the latter referred to the former as a 'hustler' in one of his letters.

Eusebius states that Origen was only in Rome briefly before returning to his duties of catechetical instruction in Antioch (*HE* 6.14.10–11), and he does not mention that the Origen ever met Hippolytus, let alone that he attended a service by Hippolytus in Rome. Presumably, an encounter between Origen and Hippolytus would have been the subject of much attention, but absolutely nothing is said about this anywhere, even in the later accounts that have clearly inflated that of Eusebius. Is it fair to assume all of this about Origen's time in Rome? Smith seems to think so, since, without providing *any* further evidence, he hastily concludes, 'In any case it is clear that Origen knew of Gaius' argument against Jn. 1–2.'<sup>34</sup>

Third, given Gaius' reputation as an opponent of Montanism, if Origen drew these criticisms from Gaius there would presumably be some element of an anti-Montanist polemic or anti-Johannine rhetoric couched in terms that suggest some degree of reticence concerning John's Paraclete passages or prophecy in general. But Origen does not provide any of this. Instead, the evidence supports the argument that Origen expresses *his own* views.

32 Marcovich, 9.

33 Ibid.

34 Smith, 'Gaius,' 196.

Finally, much has been made of the fact that Epiphanius records aspects of the objections to John's gospel as originating from an individual rather than a group of heretics. In both objections to the Gospel of John (*Haer.* 51.4.6, 22.1) Epiphanius introduces these criticisms with the singular 'he says' (φησίν). For some, this is proof positive that behind this heretical 'group' there is a single individual: Gaius of Rome.<sup>35</sup> Yet the same argument can be made that Epiphanius' use of the singular points towards Origen, not Gaius. Furthermore, the use of the singular in his portrayal of the criticisms in conjunction with the use of the plural elsewhere in his testimony could suggest a two-pronged indictment: Origen *as well as* those who followed him or share sympathetic views are guilty of denying the Johannine Logos. They are *Alogi*.

Smith notes that there exist a variety of accounts in which some attack apparent inconsistencies in Scripture in order to discredit them.<sup>36</sup> He goes on to argue, 'In none of these writings hwoever [sic] are the contradictions reported as precisely as those of Gaius.'<sup>37</sup> The emphasis on precision is a worthwhile point, but it does not work in Smith's favor. In fact, the *Alogi*'s objections against the Gospel of John, have stronger parallels to those found in Origen's *Commentary on John* than what bar Salibi records of the 'heretic' in his own *Commentary on John*.

For example, bar Salibi notes, 'The heretic Gaius criticized John because it did not agree with the other gospels, saying that after the baptism He went to Galilee and performed the miracle of the wine in Cana.'<sup>38</sup> This objection broadly conforms to that of the *Alogi*.<sup>39</sup> However, Origen specifies his criticism in a way that concurs with the more precise nature of the *Alogi*'s objection: he states that John is incompatible with the Synoptics in regards to the time of Jesus' baptism because, *it omits the story of Jesus' temptation* (cf. *Haer.* 51.18.6). Furthermore, bar Salibi does not record anything about the number of

35 'Our conclusion is that Epiphanius is extracting these quotations from a source in which the objections were attributed to one single individual, who is Gaius himself!' Smith, 'Gaius,' 233.

36 E.g. Justin's Trypho (*Dial.* 66–7); Rhodon's dialogue with Apelles (*HE* 5.13.6, 9); Marcion's argument against the Old Testament because it contradicted the Gospel (*viz. his Gospel*).

37 Smith, 'Gaius,' 286.

38 '*Gaius haereticus* reprehendat Johannem quia non concors fuit cum sociis, dicentibus, quod post baptismum abiit in Galilaeam, et fecit miraculum vini in Katna.' Latin translation by Dudley Loftus, *Fell. MSS.* 6 and 7 in the Bodleian Library; recorded in Harris, 48.

39 Although it is important to remember that the name 'Gaius' is wanting in both of the manuscripts of bar Salibi's commentary that are housed in the British Library (MSS Add. 7184 and 12,143), leaving the origins of this objection anonymous: 'A certain heretic criticized John . . .' See Harris, 'Presbyter Gaius,' 48–9.

Passovers in John versus the number recorded in the Synoptics. Long ago, this fact proved problematic for Harris, who preceded Schwartz in suggesting that Gaius must be the source for both these criticisms. Despite the fact there was no evidence linking Gaius or bar Salibi with this second objection, Harris nevertheless surmised, 'certainly Hippolytus must have dealt with the objection made by the Alogi on the subject of the Passovers.'<sup>40</sup> But if this were the case, and if bar Salibi used Hippolytus' refutation of Gaius as his source, why did bar Salibi not mention it at all? In contrast, it has been demonstrated that Origen raised a similar objection (*Comm. Jo.* 10.14–15) that corresponds well with the second criticism of the *Alogi* (*Haer.* 51.22.1).

What does one make of this? Epiphanius' testimony is void of anything that would resemble anti-Montanism with which Gaius was so clearly concerned. Rather, the evidence points in another direction: Epiphanius' testimony is saturated with anti-Origenist polemics. There are numerous other examples throughout the account of the *Alogi* to demonstrate this.

### 8.7 Other Examples of Anti-Origenism in Epiphanius' Account of the *Alogi*

There are a number of additional instances that demonstrate that Epiphanius is engaged with the testimony of Origen in his account of the *Alogi*. J.F. Dechow has argued that the focal point of the entirety of Epiphanius' *Panarion* is a polemic against Origen. He states, 'Epiphanius was sure that Origen was the epitome and exemplar of all heresies from the beginning of time,' and furthermore, 'All heresies, in Epiphanius' mind, are ultimately related to the mode or content of Origen's thought and to some degree diminish that which the creed with its *homoousion* expresses: the reality of the triune God; specifically, the fully divine and fully human reality of Jesus Christ, God's Son, the Savior.'<sup>41</sup> Lest one think Dechow overstates his case, it is important to note that Epiphanius himself makes it abundantly clear. For example, in his letter to John of Jerusalem, whom Epiphanius deemed guilty of Origenist sympathies, he claims Origen to be the 'spiritual father of Arius' and the 'root and parent of all heresies' (*Ep.* 51, 3–4). Origen's actions are similar to the Manichaeans, Ebionites, Marcionites and the votaries of the other eighty heresies. Epiphanius reiterates the same argument in the *Panarion* (*Haer.* 64.4.2).

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., 55.

<sup>41</sup> Dechow, 13.



### 8.7.1 *Origen's Christology*

One primary area of concern for Epiphanius was Origen's christology, which is addressed in the conclusion of Epiphanius rebuttal to the first objection of the *Alogi*. Here Epiphanius recounts the story of Jn. 5:18, where the Jews persecuted Jesus because he said that God was His Father, thus making Himself *equal* to God. Epiphanius then asks, 'How can the sects which make the Son inferior to the Father not be condemned? For the gospel says "making himself equal with God"' (*Haer.* 51.21.30). It is true that the Ebionites and Cerinthus are seen throughout his testimony, but it is also necessary to add Origen to this category.<sup>42</sup> In his condemnation of Origen, Epiphanius is explicitly clear about how he feels about Origen's christology. Epiphanius points to his *Commentary on Psalms* as an example of his belief that Jesus was 'created' (γενητός) and thus had a subordinate status to the Father (*Haer.* 64.7.4, 8.1–8).<sup>43</sup> Epiphanius records verbatim portions of Origen's commentary on the Psalms to demonstrate his errant christology: 'And here, immediately, is each word in such a knowledgeable manner, O eager hearer, that he declared the Son of God appeared as a creature' (*Haer.* 64.5.11). Earlier in his attack on Origen, Epiphanius states that his first downfall is the denial that the Son is of the same essence as the Father, but was created (κτιστόν). Rather, it is by grace that Christ is called 'Son' (*Haer.* 64.4.3–4). He then goes on in *Haer.* 64.9 to argue, in much the same way as the passage noted above (*Haer.* 51.21.30):

(1) But let us look at the four gospels, through which, when the divine Word came, revealed life to all of us, and see if Christ has ever said, "God created me," or "My Father created me!" And let us see if the Father made known in any of the gospels, "I have created the Son and I have sent him to you." (2) Now, I have had enough of this; concerning written witnesses, I have often quoted them against those who introduce the idea of being created. (3) However, it will not be annoying to show how easy the term can be refuted and I ask the aspiring sage, "How is it possible he is a crea-

42 Smith ('Gaius,' 387) points the finger in this direction.

43 See Dechow, 280 for other 'creature-words' Epiphanius uses to describe Origen's view of the Son of God, though Dechow may be right in suggesting that Epiphanius 'understands Origen only in an exaggerated anti-Arian sense.' Dechow's premise (273) is that, 'Despite the decline of interest in anti-subordinationism as primary grounds for anti-Origenism by 376, Epiphanius' accusation shows how deeply rooted such criticism was among Nicene conservatives.' As he says later (285), this is seen in that 'the Arians capitalized on the *ktisma*-terminology for the sake of magnifying the distinctiveness of the Son from the unbegotten Father.'



ture when it says, 'I am in the Father and the Father is in me, and the two of us are one'?" (Jn. 14:10; 10:30; *Haer.* 64.9.1–3).<sup>44</sup>

Here Epiphanius uses the Gospel of John to refute Origen's christology, for it is in this Gospel that Christ's full deity is most clearly expressed.<sup>45</sup> As he states, confusion over the incarnation of Jesus persisted even after the writing of the Synoptics, which is why the Holy Spirit compelled John to write his Gospel and emphasize both the human and divine aspects of Christ (*Haer.* 51.12.1–8). Recalling the way in which Epiphanius describes the *Alogi*, Origen fits the mould quite well. Epiphanius states, 'I was correct to call this heresy Ἄλογοι for they have not accepted the divine Word who came from above, which has been preached by John' (*Haer.* 51.17.10).<sup>46</sup>

### 8.7.2 *Textual Anomalies in Origen and Epiphanius*

Another example of Epiphanius' use of Origen in his account of the *Alogi* is found in a unique textual link between Origen and Epiphanius. In *Comm. Jo.* 6.24, Origen records a distinctive reading of Jn. 1:28.

"These things happened in Bethabara (Βηθαβαρά), on the other side of the Jordan, where John was baptizing." However, we know in nearly all of the other copies (ἀντιγράφους) it reads, "These things happened in Bethany." And this seems to have been the way it was rendered at earlier, as in Heracleon, where we know it as "Bethany". But we know for sure that it is not "Bethany", but "Bethabara".<sup>47</sup>

Origen then proceeds to offer geographical reasons for editing this passage in this way. This textual emendation is uniquely Origen's, but it also reappears in the account of the *Alogi*.

In their work, *The Text of the Fourth Gospel in the Writings of Origen*, Ehrman, Fee, and Holmes have reconstructed Origen's manuscript of John as reading:

44 GCS 31,2 *Epiphanius II*, 418.

45 Cf. Clark, *Origenist Controversy*, 90–1.

46 Hill (*Johannine Corpus*, 189 n. 60) provides an additional example, where he notes that Epiphanius (*Haer.* 51.15.7–12, 51.17.4, 9) is likely responding to Origen's discussion (*Comm. Jo.* 10.6) of the apparent discrepancy between Jesus calling Andrew and Peter in Judea after the baptism recorded by John (Jn. 1:40–42) and his calling of them in Galilee by the lake, as found in Matthew (Mt. 4:18–22).

47 SC 157, 284–6.

ταυτα εν Βηθανια εγενετο περαν του Ιορδανου, οπου ην Ιωαννης βαπτιζων.<sup>48</sup> They preserved the reading of Βηθανια rather than Βηθαβαρα because they 'are interested in determining what Origen's MSS read, not what he, on the basis of his own scholarly work, believed the original text of the Fourth Gospel to have been.'<sup>49</sup> According to these scholars, 'He himself emended Βηθανια the reading found in his MSS of the Fourth Gospel, to Βηθαβαρα.' Furthermore, Origen's statement that 'nearly all' other copies read Βηθανια 'should probably be taken, then, as hyperbole; so far as we can tell, none of his MSS read otherwise.'<sup>50</sup>

Turning to Epiphanius, in *Haer.* 51.13.1 he states, 'And when he describes all these things he says, "These things were done in Bethabara"—but in other copies (ἀντιγράφους) 'in Bethany, beyond the Jordan' (Jn. 1:28). Epiphanius clearly reproduces the very reading that Origen claims to have provided himself. One could argue that Epiphanius is simply using a later manuscript that had adopted Origen's use of Βηθαβαρα, but if this were the case, he would not have provided the identical notice that it reads Βηθανια in other copies (ἀντιγράφους).<sup>51</sup> Furthermore, to give one final correlation between Epiphanius and Origen, Epiphanius repeats Origen's notice that Cana means 'the bride' at the end of his defence of the Gospel of John (*Haer.* 51.30.10; cf. *Comm. Jo.* 13.62). There can be no doubt that Epiphanius has a copy of Origen's *Commentary on John* in front of him throughout his construction of the *Alogi*.

### Summary

Origen's testimony in his *Commentary on John* has far too many parallels with the record of Epiphanius to deny its relevance in the formation of the sect that Epiphanius calls the *Alogi*. Epiphanius has used the criticisms of his theological nemesis, the 'aspiring sage' (ἐθελόσοφον), as the proof-text for the criticisms of the *Alogi* against the Gospel of John. By questioning whether the gospels were written by a divine Spirit (*Comm. Jo.* 10.2), Origen has committed the irre-

48 Bart Ehrman, Gordon Fee and Michael Holmes, *The Text of the Fourth Gospel in the Writings of Origen*, vol. 1 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 72. See also B. Metzger, *Historical and Literary Studies: Pagan, Jewish and Christian*, New Testament Tools and Studies, vol. 8 (Leiden: Brill, 1968), 96–7. 'Among present-day witnesses to the reading Βηθαβαρα / are C<sup>2</sup> K U L 083 1 22 33 syr<sup>s,c</sup> arm geo.'

49 Ehrman, et al., 72.

50 Ibid., n. 22. See also T.D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (London: Harvard University Press, 1981), 109.

51 In his argument that Gaius is the true identity of the *Alogi*, Smith wrongly presumes this section must have come from a lost Hippolytan work. Smith, 'Gaius', 393–4.

missible sin. He is not alone, however. Epiphanius surrounds him with other heretics that deny the full authority that belongs to the gospels. Nevertheless, it is upon Origen's criticisms regarding the validity of the historical truths of the gospels that Epiphanius is able to build his case against all those that do not believe that the gospels agree and the evangelists do not contradict each other (*Haer.* 51.30.14). Epiphanius was not the only person to respond to Origen, however. As I shall demonstrate in the next chapter, Eusebius also reacted negatively to his opinions.

## Epiphanius' Use of Eusebius

Origen was not only Epiphanius' source for the objections of the *Alogi* to the Gospel of John, Eusebius also found his criticisms to have gone too far. Although he does not explicitly indict Origen, Eusebius also provides a defence against Origen's views that the Gospel of John disagrees with the Synoptics. As an outspoken supporter of Origen, Eusebius is careful to couch his own argument for the compatibility of the gospels in subtle terms, so as not to impugn his hero. He accomplishes this task by manipulating the testimony of someone for which he has far less admiration: Papias of Hierapolis. This rebuttal became an integral part of Epiphanius' defence.

Eusebius preserves portions of the tradition of Papias concerning the origins of the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, but he makes no mention of any Papias comments about Luke or John. However, other scholars have argued that Papias likely did speak of the Gospel of John. Notably, Charles E. Hill has argued that Eusebius' testimony concerning the origins of the Gospel of John (*HE* 3.24.5–13) may originate with Papias, but Eusebius failed to ascribe it to him. Hill's argument is compelling and, generally speaking, convincing. However, it is unlikely that the entirety of this passage comes from Papias alone. Rather, Eusebius blends aspects of what Papias had to say with his own solution to the discrepancies noted by Origen. In turn, Eusebius' response to Origen was to find its way into the testimony of the *Alogi*.

### 9.1 Eusebius, Papias, and Origen on the Four Gospels<sup>1</sup>

Eusebius begins his account in this way: 'Let us now show the undisputed writings of this apostle (John). Firstly, his Gospel, which is known to all the churches under heaven,<sup>2</sup> is acknowledged as genuine. That it has with good reason been put by the men of old in the fourth place after the other three may be seen in this manner ...' (*HE* 3.24.1b-2). After discussing the veracity and

1 Significant portions of this chapter also appear in T. Scott Manor, 'Papias, Origen and Eusebius: The Criticisms and Defense of the Gospel of John.' *VC* 67.1 (2013), 1–21.

2 Cf. Origen *ap.* Eusebius (*HE* 6.25.4): '... the four gospels, which are the only indisputable ones in the Church of God under heaven.'

trustworthiness of the apostles, Eusebius continues to offer a similar account of the Gospel origins as found in the writings of Papias, Irenaeus and Origen.

5. But still, of all the disciples of the Lord, only Matthew and John have left us their recollections (ὑπομνήματα). A record preserves (κατέχει λόγος) that they came to write out of necessity (ἐπ'ἀνάγκης). 6. For Matthew, who first preached to the Hebrews, when he was about to go to others, compensated those from whom he was sent for the lack of his presence, having transmitted his gospel in writing, in his native language. 7. And when Mark and Luke had already written their own gospels, it is said (φασί) that John gave an unwritten proclamation (κηρύγματι) all the time, and finally came to write for the following reason. The three gospels already having been written and distributed to all, as well as to himself, it is said (φασιν) that he welcomed (ἀποδέξασθαι) them and testified to their truth (ἀλήθειαν αὐτοῖς ἐπιμαρτυρήσαντα), but the only thing missing in the writing was an narrative (διήγησιν) about the things done by Christ at the beginning and the outset of the proclamation (κηρύγματος). 8. The record<sup>3</sup> is certainly true (καὶ ἀληθὴς γε ὁ λόγος).

[8b] For it is seen that the three evangelists had written down (συγγεγραφότας) only the deeds done by the Savior during one year after the imprisonment of John the Baptist, and they indicated precisely this element at the beginning of their historical accounts (ἱστορίας). 9. For Matthew, after the forty days fast and the temptation that followed it, indicates the time of his own written account, saying, "But when he heard that John was imprisoned, he withdrew from Judea into Galilee" (Mt. 4:12). 10. And Mark in a like manner, "Now after the imprisonment of John," he says, "Jesus came to Galilee" (Mk. 1:14). And Luke, prior to beginning the account of the deeds of Jesus, in a similar way, affirms the order up front, noting that Herod, adding to his evil acts, "shut up John in prison" (Lk. 3:19–20). 11. Now that on account of these things they say (φασι) the apostle John was exhorted (παρακληθέντα) to hand down (παραδοῦναι) in his Gospel an account of the time passed over in silence (παρασιωπηθέντα,) by the first evangelists and the acts done by the Savior during this period (these being the acts before the imprisonment of the Baptist). This he indicates when he says, "This is the first of the miracles (παραδόξων) Jesus performed" (Jn. 2:11). And then, referring to

3 The word λόγος referring to κατέχει λόγος in 3.24.5. For κατέχει λόγος in Eusebius as indicative of a written record, see esp. Lawlor, *Eusebiana*, 22. Further scholarship in support of this rendering may be found in Hill, 'What Papias Said,' 590, n. 21.

(μνημονεύσαντα) the Baptist in the midst of the acts of Jesus, [John] still baptizing in the Aenon near Salim, where he states clearly, “For John was not yet cast into prison” (Jn. 3:24).<sup>12</sup> Therefore John in his written Gospel hands down (παράδιδωσιν) the things accomplished by Christ before John was cast into prison, but the other three evangelists recall (μνημονεύουσιν) the things after the imprisonment of the Baptist.<sup>13</sup> And if these things are understood, no longer do the gospels appear to disagree with one another (δόξαι διαφωνεῖν ἀλλήλοις τὰ εὐαγγέλια), for that according to John comprises the first acts of Christ, but the rest [record] the history (ἱστορίαν) of the of what happened to Him at the end the period. Naturally, John was silent concerning the genealogy of our Savior according to the flesh, seeing as it was previously recorded in Matthew and Luke; but he began with the description of his divinity, which, as it were, was reserved for him, as their superior, by the Holy Spirit.<sup>4</sup>

Eusebius does not indicate where he derived this account of the order of the gospels, but it is clear that he is drawing from a previous source. In *HE* 3.24.5 Eusebius remarks that ‘a record preserves’ (κατέχει λόγος) that the Gospel writers composed their works out of necessity. H. Lawlor has shown that the phrase κατέχει λόγος is a common introductory formula for Eusebius’ inclusion of a narrative of some source, either oral or written.<sup>5</sup> As to the identity of Eusebius’ source, some scholars have floated the possibility of Origen or Clement of Alexandria, although, on their own, neither is a truly viable candidate.<sup>6</sup> Hegesippus is a contender, particularly given the identical

4 Because this chapter deals primarily with Hill’s proposal, and in order to maintain uniformity of the evidence, I have largely kept Hill’s interpretation of specific vocabulary.

5 Lawlor, *Evsebian*, 21–2. According to Lawlor (22), the author of the source (if written) can be determined by ‘a search through the passages from previous writers scattered over his pages’. See also Andrew Carriker, *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea*, *VCSupp* 67 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 63ff.

6 Smith ‘Gaius,’ 193, n. 1 notes Origen as a possibility. Hill (‘What Papias Said,’ 608–11) has shown that this is not possible. See also W. Sanday, *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel* (New York: Scribner’s, 1905), 69–70, who thinks it is likely Clement of Alexandria. But Clement’s record of the origins of the Gospels preserved in Eusebius *HE* 6.14, while similar in parts, has marked differences that prevent Clement from being Eusebius’ source (e.g. Clement’s order of the Gospels begins with Matthew and Luke). Furthermore, Clement states that he received his information from ‘the tradition of the earliest presbyters’ (*HE* 6.14.5). In addition, Eusebius draws parallels between the account of Clement and Papias on the Gospel of Mark in *HE* 2.15.2, from which one could infer that Papias was a source of Clement. Here, see Bauckham, ‘Papias,’ 62. For further discussion, see Hill, ‘What Papias Said,’ 607ff.

introductory formula (κατέχει λόγος) Eusebius uses to introduce his accounts (HE 3.11–12, 19; 3.32.1).<sup>7</sup> Hippolytus has also been suggested as Eusebius' source.<sup>8</sup> This is possible, but also entirely unverifiable, since there is no evidence from any of his writings to substantiate this hypothesis. Even Sanday, who put Hippolytus' name forward as a possibility, chalked up this attribution to nothing more than a 'guess' and leaned in stronger favor of Clement.

Charles Hill, however, argues that it originates from Papias. Although there is no extant writing from Papias with which one can compare this portion of Eusebius on the Gospel of John, the evidence does seem to stack up, at least partially, in Hill's favor.<sup>9</sup> Yet, while I agree with much of his argument that there is ample reason to think that Papias is behind *some* of the tradition Eusebius records in HE 3.24.5–13, there are clear instances where Eusebius has broken away from his source to provide *his own* response to the question of the discrepancies among the gospels. To prove this, it is necessary to first consider Hill's argument more carefully.

### 9.1.1 *The Argument of Charles E. Hill*

Hill's argument may be summarized as follows. First, it is often overlooked that in 3.24.5–13 Eusebius is paraphrasing a written account.<sup>10</sup> This is seen in Eusebius' use of the phrases 'a record preserves' (κατέχει λόγος; 3.24.5), 'the record is certainly true' (καὶ ἀληθὴς γε ὁ λόγος; 3.24.8), and the less precise 'they

7 On the use of κατέχει λόγος in association with Hegesippus, though not specifically HE 3.24, see F.J.A. Hort, *Judaistic Christianity: A Course of Lectures* (Cambridge: Macmillan and Co., 1894), 170–173; Lawlor, *Evsebian*, 23–26, 50ff. Hill does not consider Hegesippus as a possible alternative source.

8 Sanday, *Criticism*, 69.

9 Hill, 'What Papias Said,' 582–629; *Johannine Corpus*, 186, 384–395, points to the analysis of Lawlor and others to support his argument. Hill notes that he was preceded in this notion of Papian attribution by V. Bartlet, 'Papias' "Exposition": Its Date and Contents,' in *Amicitiae Corolla. A Volume of Essays Presented to James Rendel Harris, D. Litt. On the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday*, ed. H.G. Wood (London: University of London Press, 1933), 15–44. Graham N. Stanton ('The Fourfold Gospel,' *New Testament Studies* 43.3 [1997], 333) is convinced Papias knew the Gospel of John based on his order of disciples that is found only in the Fourth Gospel. This point is shared by Richard Bauckham, 'Papias,' 44ff., who also argues that 'There should be no doubt that Papias knew the Fourth Gospel' (44). See also, Hengel (*Four Gospels*, 45–6, 238 n. 192), who argues that this tradition does not belong in the second-century and that the portion on John may come from Papias or a third-century source. See also *Johannine Question*, 17–21; Lawlor, *Evsebian*, 22, n. 2, though he thinks it may only apply to the material on the Gospel of Matthew. Cf. Campenhausen, *Formation*, 199, n. 259.

10 See Hill, 'What Papias Said,' 588–92.

say' (φασι; 3.24.7, 11). He argues that the phrase κατέχει λόγος is of particular value in signifying a written source.<sup>11</sup> For Hill, this is none other than Papias, and he goes on to argue that the rest of the testimony in *HE* 3.24.5–13 is tied to this introduction, as is seen in the similar phrase associated with Eusebius' testimony of the Gospel of John (καὶ ἀληθὴς γὰρ ὁ λόγος; *HE* 3.24.8), which he argues is a reference to the earlier, similar statement.

There are two other primary factors Hill cites in support of Papias as Eusebius' source in *HE* 3.24.5–13. First, he notes a number of parallels that link his source in *HE* 3.24 with Papias' account of the origins of Matthew and Mark (*HE* 2.15.1–2; 3.39.15–16).<sup>12</sup> Secondly, he notes parallels with other authors who knew Papias' work, such as Clement of Alexandria, the *Muratorian Fragment*, Origen, Irenaeus, and (later) Victorinus of Pettau.<sup>13</sup>

Finally, Hill claims that Eusebius' source could not have come from any alternatives.<sup>14</sup> This is a solid case for suggesting that a lost portion of the record of Papias underlies some of Eusebius' testimony in *HE* 3.24.5–13; however, there are also a number of additional questions that deserve attention.

For example, Richard Bauckham, while generally inclined towards Hill's argument, has suggested a handful of qualifications. Two of these are particularly compelling. First, he holds that Hill has not delimited Eusebius' source closely enough.<sup>15</sup> Bauckham suggests Eusebius does indeed use his source in *HE* 3.24.5–8a, but there is a break from *HE* 3.24.8b–10 where Eusebius provides his own analysis. After this the source appears to be used again, as indicated

11 Here, Hill follows Lawlor, *Evsebianā*, 22. Lawlor recognized that it is a 'fair inference' that Eusebius derived his information on Matthew (*HE* 3.24.5) from the accounts of Papias (*HE* 3.39.16), Irenaeus (*HE* 5.8.2), or perhaps Origen (*HE* 6.25.4); but that is as far as he would go in pointing to Papias as the full source of Eusebius' testimony in *HE* 3.24.5–13. Hill is right in noting that Eusebius attributes to this same written record both the Matthean and Johannine traditions: 'A record preserves (κατέχει λόγος) that they (*viz.* Matthew and John) took to writing out of necessity' (*HE* 3.24.5).

12 See Hill, 'What Papias Said,' 592–96. He lists the following examples: (i) authorial humility, (ii) distillation of apostolic preaching, (iii) Apostolic 'memoirs' (ὑπομνήματα), (iv) order of events in the Gospels (τάξις), and (v) canonical ratification. Hill provides a summary of his own argument in *Johannine Corpus*, 385–94, 409–16; also, 'The Fragments of Papias,' in *The Writings of the Apostolic Fathers*. 42–51. Ed. Paul Foster (New York: T&T Press, 2007), 46–7.

13 Hill, 'What Papias Said,' 596–607. Hill lists the following parallels: (i) writing by request, (ii) order in the Gospels, (iii) evangelists as 'publishers', and (iv) the number and order of the Gospels.

14 *Ibid.*, 606–11.

15 Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 433.



by 'they say' in 3.24.11, after which Eusebius again issues his own comments in *HE* 3.24.12–13. These statements may utilize some of the vocabulary of the source, but they do not strictly reflect the source itself, especially since 'Eusebius can be quite free in his paraphrasing.'<sup>16</sup>

Second, Bauckham notes that Hill's argument regarding Papias' concern for the 'order' in the gospels, when applied to the Gospel of John, does recognize the differences between John and the gospels; but while recognition of 'order' is a common factor, the solution to each case is quite different.<sup>17</sup> He points to *HE* 3.39.15–16, where Papias admits Mark's gospel is not 'in order'. The implied solution to the different order of events in the gospels that 'Papias must be inferred to have offered' is that John's gospel follows a correct chronological order while Matthew's and Mark's do not. In contrast, in *HE* 3.24.5–13, the solution is markedly different. Here, all four are reconciled without any being considered out of order; rather, the explanation given is that John wrote of the events prior to the Baptist's imprisonment and the others record the events that happened afterwards. If Eusebius' source is responsible for this explanation of the differences (*HE* 3.24.11–13), Bauckham argues, then it points in favor of the conclusion that it was *not* Papias, for it is inconsistent with aspects of Papias' comments on Mark in his undisputed fragment (*HE* 3.39.15).

Hill has dismissed Bauckham's point about not delimiting the source as something that he allowed for in his original argument. In so doing he disregards its potential impact in calling into question whether the entirety of this passage came from Papias alone.<sup>18</sup> Regarding Bauckham's second point, Hill admits that further explanation is required. He then reproduces and expands various points made in his original article before concluding, 'I do not regard Bauckham's "qualifications" as carrying any weight against the identification of Eusebius' source in *Hist. eccl.* 3.24.5–13 as Papias.'<sup>19</sup>

However, Hill may have misjudged the value Bauckham's critique. First, I believe he is too quick to dismiss the issue of delimiting the text and that Bauckham's point may, in fact, stand—namely that there appear to be breaks in the text that indicate Eusebius has dropped his source. This goes hand in hand with Bauckham's second point. Although Hill makes a solid case for seeing *portions* of this testimony relating to the testimonies of others that knew the Papian tradition, he has overlooked the fact that the argument made in

---

16 Ibid.

17 Ibid., 435–7.

18 Hill, 'The Orthodox Gospel,' 288.

19 Ibid., 294.

*HE* 3.24.8b-13 is not found anywhere else prior to Eusebius' testimony and thus may not be a part of the Papian tradition at all. Rather, I believe that this portion of Eusebius' testimony constitutes a response to the criticism of Johannine incompatibility with the chronology of the Synoptics, which Origen states in his *Commentary on John* (10.2).

It is clear from the previous chapter that Origen knows and affirms the Papian tradition (cf. *HE* 3.39.15-16). In light of this, if Hill's hypothesis is correct and Papias is the source for the entirety of Eusebius' account in *HE* 3.24.5-13, it makes little sense that Origen would still record the criticisms surrounding the discrepancies of the gospels found in the *Comm. Jo.* 10 if Papias had already addressed them. Is it possible that although Origen was well aware of the Papian tradition, he did not know of the argument concerning the harmony of the gospels in *HE* 3.24.5b-13 because it was never a part of the Papian tradition at all? A closer look at the corroborating witnesses to the Papian tradition will provide clarity to this question.

### 9.1.2 *Corroborating Witnesses?*

If Eusebius' argument for the compatibility of the gospels did originate with Papias, there should be some reference to this in the other testimonies that rely on his tradition. Hill notes a number of parallels with other authors who were concerned with the 'order' in the gospels and who (most likely) knew Papias' testimony,<sup>20</sup> but nowhere in these works does one find anything that resembles the argument found in *HE* 3.24.8b-13.

This is all the more surprising given the fact, which Hill repeatedly emphasizes, that the authors who knew Papias' tradition were concerned with the 'order' (τάξις) in the gospels. He states, 'All accounts (Papias and those early writers who knew his work) profess themselves to be aware of the differences between John's and the other three gospels, and the question of 'order' is present here in 3.24 as it is in Papias' account of Mark.'<sup>21</sup> This is true, but it does not necessarily follow that their concern for 'order' extended specifically to the events surrounding the wedding in Cana and those that occurred before and after John's imprisonment. Clearly, Origen took a strong stance against the harmony of these events and they are also the focus in *HE* 3.24.11-13, not to mention Epiphanius' testimony of the *Alogi*. But, none of the other early witnesses that Hill associates with the Papian tradition address this chronological conflict.

<sup>20</sup> Hill, 'What Papias Said,' 596-606.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 597; see also his discussion 596-602.

For example, consider the *Muratorian Fragment*, to which both Hill and Bauckham often refer as a likely source that reflects Papias' statements. In the middle of its statements concerning the Fourth Gospel, it mentions the 'different beginnings'<sup>22</sup> (*uaria . . . principia*) of the gospels, but these *uaria principia* 'make no difference to the faith of believers.' What follows is a list of things declared by the 'one sovereign Spirit': Jesus' nativity, passion, resurrection, walk with His disciples and double advent. No mention is made of Jesus' temptation, baptism or first miracle.<sup>23</sup> This is striking, especially given Bauckham's statement that 'the differences between John and the Synoptics' was something that the author of the *Muratorian Fragment* 'was particularly conscious of.'<sup>24</sup> It is also notable that all the other early writers who knew Papias' testimony fail to note these specific issues raised by Eusebius. Rather, the predominant concern among those who appear reliant upon the Papian tradition is the very beginnings of the gospels. It is seen, for example, in Irenaeus (*AH* 3.11.8), Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* 4.2) and Julius Africanus' defense of the different genealogical accounts of Matthew and Luke (*HE* 1.7.1).

Indeed, out of all these possibilities Irenaeus would presumably be our best bet for a source that contained any indication of Papias having recorded what

22 I follow Hill's translation here. I agree with his argument (*ibid.*, 586, n. 13) that the context of the *Muratorian Fragment* suggests that *principia* should be rendered 'beginnings' not 'elements'.

23 Hill argues (*ibid.*, 597) that Eusebius quotes Jn. 2:11 in *HE* 3.24.11, in which he employs the unique word *παράδοξων* rather than the more common term, *σημείων*, which is universally attested in the MS tradition. Because, Hill argues, the Latin Vulgate translates *παράδοξος* as *mirabilium* in Lk. 5:26, so also the original Greek of the *Muratorian Fragment* must have used *παράδοξων* rather than *σημείων*—just as in the case of Eusebius' citation of Jn. 2:11. Yet there is reason to refrain from attaching too much value to this connection. First, it should be noted that there is no indication that the *Fragment* is citing Jn. 2:11 at all. Rather it cites 1 Jn. 1:1–3 before making a general statement about John's role as an 'eyewitness' and writer of the 'marvellous deeds of the Lord in order.' The theme of Jesus' 'marvellous deeds' runs throughout the Fourth Gospel (e.g. 2:23; 3:2; 4:54; 6:2, 14, 26, 30; 7:31; 9:16; 11:47; 12:18, 37; 20:30), and thus it is more likely that the *Fragment* is referring to this constant Johannine theme rather than Jn. 2:11 specifically. In a similar way, Origen uses *παράδοξοις* rather than *σημεία* in his polemic against Celsus, where he refers generally to the 'marvellous deeds of Jesus' (7.54). Secondly, the Vulgate also uses *mirabilium* as the Latin translation for *θαυμάσια* in Mt. 21:15. Thus *mirabilium* does not strictly correlate with *παράδοξος*. Thirdly, Eusebius appears to be paraphrasing Jn. 2:11 in *HE* 3.24.11, not citing it verbatim. In any case, there is no reason to believe *παράδοξων* must have originated with Papias. Thus the appearance of *παράδοξων* rather than *σημείων* may not bear as much value in the end as Hill suggests.

24 Bauckham, 'Papias and Polycrates,' 55.

is found in *HE* 3.24.8b-13, due to the fact that he had the writings of Papias in front of him (*AH* 5.33.4; *HE* 3.39.1) and he was well acquainted with the Asia Minor tradition both personally and through the knowledge he gained from Polycarp. Yet where one might expect to find such a testimony, such as Irenaeus' discussion of the events surrounding Jesus' baptism and miracle at Cana (*AH* 2.22) and his argument for the necessity of a four-fold Gospel (*AH* 3.11), there is nothing to suggest that he knew of the account found in Eusebius' testimony.<sup>25</sup> In fact, out of the various early Christian writers to use Papias' testimony, none of them approximate what is found in *HE* 3.24.8b-13.

At this point there are two primary explanations for the questions surrounding Eusebius' testimony: either (i) Hill is correct and Papias is the source for what is found in *HE* 3.24.8-13, and everyone up to Eusebius simply ignored Papias' testimony, *and*, with the exception of Origen, they also ignored the apparent problem of the divergent portrayal of the events in John's Gospel; *or* (ii) the testimony in *HE* 3.24.8-13 did not originate from Papias and Eusebius has derived his information from elsewhere. If the second explanation is correct, there must be evidence that Eusebius has shifted away from using his earlier source. There should also be telltale signs that he is engaged with the Origen's criticism of the inconsistencies found in John's narrative.

### 9.1.3 *The Limits of Eusebius' Source*

Because Eusebius is paraphrasing his source, it is not easy to determine exactly where his source material and his own comments begin and end. Yet, as Bauckham has noted, it is difficult to suppose with Hill that Papias is behind all of the content of *HE* 3.24.5-13. In particular, Bauckham suggests that the

25 Hill ('What Papias Said,' 600-1) points to Irenaeus' use of παραδεδοκέναι (Greek text in Eusebius 3.23.3 citing *AH* 2.22.5) and Eusebius' use of παραδούναί found in Eusebius, *HE* 3.24.11 to suggest that they used the same source and that both Irenaeus and Eusebius convey that John 'handed down' something that would prove that Jesus' ministry lasted well beyond his thirtieth year.' Hill (*ibid.*, 600) states: '[A]ll Irenaeus may have needed from the independent witness of 'the elders' was simply an affirmation that Jesus' ministry actually began well before the 'one year' which seemingly formed the basis of the synoptic accounts... What may have been in the 'elders' witness' was simply a defence of the order of events in John based partly on the claim that John had recorded events from the early ministry of John which had been omitted by the other evangelists, thus confirming that the ministry of Jesus was in reality substantially longer than is recorded in Matthew, Mark, and Luke.' Yet, in *AH* 2.22 Irenaeus makes no mention or allusion to the discrepancies of the Gospels. Rather, as noted in Chapter 7, he is combating the views of the Valentinians in *AH* 2.22 that the thirty years of Jesus' life corresponds to their thirty Aons. See also Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 431.

phrase in 3.24.8, 'The record is indeed true' (καὶ ἀληθὴς γε ὁ λόγος) marks the end of the passage drawn from the source, beginning in 3.24.5 with the phrase 'tradition says' (κατέχει λόγος). He continues by arguing that the rest of *HE* 3.24.8 through *HE* 3.24.10 'is Eusebius' own explanatory comment.'<sup>26</sup> Hill concedes that Eusebius does break from his source to issue his own comments, but he maintains that Eusebius is still using the information from his source.<sup>27</sup> However, Bauckham notes, Eusebius may maintain some of the vocabulary, but his comments in *HE* 3.24.8b–10 'are not to be relied on for communicating what the source itself said.'<sup>28</sup>

Eusebius' dependence upon his source does appear to end in *HE* 3.24.8 (καὶ ἀληθὴς γε ὁ λόγος), for after this one finds Eusebius' own solution to the issue of Gospel incongruities beginning to take shape. Thus, I suggest that there is an *inclusio* in which Eusebius is clearly drawing significantly from his source beginning with κατέχει λόγος in *HE* 3.24.5 and ending with καὶ ἀληθὴς γε ὁ λόγος in *HE* 3.24.8a.

What follows (3.24.8b–10) is Eusebius' argument that the Synoptics recorded the deeds of Jesus for one year *after* John the Baptist's imprisonment, for which he presents synoptic proof-texts. Eusebius prefaces his reference to Matthew by explicitly mentioning the forty-days fast and the temptation that followed it before citing Mt. 4:12. He then proceeds to cite Mk. 1:14 and Lk. 3:20.

Following this, in *HE* 3.24.11, Eusebius proceeds with 'they say' (φασί), followed by the notice that John was exhorted (παράκληθέντα) on account of these things to hand down (παράδοῦναι) in his gospel an account of the period that had been omitted by the other evangelists and the deeds done by the Savior during the time prior to the imprisonment of John the Baptist. Hill argues that Eusebius' use of *fasi* shows that he is referring back to the same written record,<sup>29</sup> but there are a number of scholars who would disagree. Lawlor<sup>30</sup> felt that the use of *φασί* here indicated an oral tradition, and Sellew<sup>31</sup> suggested that Eusebius typically uses *φασί* when 'he had no clear written authority.'

26 Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 433.

27 Hill, 'What Papias Said,' 593–4, 599; 'Orthodox Gospel,' 288.

28 Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 433.

29 Hill, 'What Papias Said,' 591. See also n. 25, where he counters the positions of Lawlor and Sellew.

30 Lawlor (*Evsebian*, 22, n. 2) states, 'For when in §§7ff. he recounts a story of the origin of St. John's Gospel, for which no earlier authority is known, he refers, and apparently with some emphasis, to common report as the evidence for what he tells (*fasi*, §§7 *bis*, 11).'

31 P. Sellew, 'Eusebius and the Gospels,' in H.W. Attridge and G. Hata, eds., *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism* *Studia Post-Biblica* 42 (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 117.

Indeed, Lawlor finds only one instance where φασι is equivalent to κατέχει λόγος (HE 7.12),<sup>32</sup> but Hill points to HE 2.15.1 as a counterexample of φασι referring to a written source (Clement of Alexandria and Papias).<sup>33</sup> Bauckham suggests that the 'likely explanation is that Eusebius' written source was itself reporting oral tradition,' but this does not mean that it was necessarily Papias.<sup>34</sup>

I am not convinced that φασι demonstrates that Eusebius is referencing the same λόγος source that he notes in HE 3.24.5, 8. Nevertheless, presuming for the moment that Hill is correct, just how much of the following information is to be attributed to this source? It could very well be that all Eusebius' source said was that John handed down (παραδοῦναι) an account that included the events in Jesus' life that the Synoptic Gospels 'passed over in silence' (παρὰσιωπηθέντα; HE 3.24.11). It is true that some of the vocabulary in HE 3.24.11 is common to what is attributed to Papias elsewhere, as Hill notes. For example, he points to the notice that John was exhorted (παρακλήθεντα; HE 3.24.11) to hand down his Gospel, which parallels what Clement and Papias say about Mark (παρακλήσεσιν; HE 2.15.1), Clement's statement that John was 'urged' to write (προτραπεύοντα; HE 6.14.7) so also the *Muratorian Fragment* and Victorinus (*cohortantibus*).<sup>35</sup> But just as there are different accounts as to who it was that requested or urged John to write his Gospel,<sup>36</sup> it is entirely possible that Eusebius could have filled in additional information that was not contained in his source (nor in any other source prior to Eusebius that used Papias). If Eusebius' source only mentions that John handed down an account of events that the Synoptics passed over in silence (παρὰσιωπηθέντα) in addition to his being 'urged', then Eusebius himself very well may have specified these events that the Synoptics passed over in HE 3.24.11 to that time which surrounds the incarceration of John the Baptist.

Eusebius repeats this argument again in HE 3.24.12, 13 all under the guise that he is recording information from his source. But as Bauckham notes, it is possible that the source itself said much less than Eusebius made it say.<sup>37</sup> Bauckham goes on to say that Eusebius' retrieval of his source probably does not extend beyond HE 3.24.11, for in HE 3.24.12–13 one finds that he adds his

32 Lawlor, *Evsebian*, 36, n. 2.

33 Hill, 'What Papias Said,' 591, n. 25; Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 435.

34 Bauckham, *Jesus as Eyewitnesses*, 434f.

35 Hill, 'What Papias Said,' 592, 596.

36 Hill (*ibid.*, 596) notes these identities as follows: Clement: τῶν γνωρίμων; *MF*: *condiscipulis*, *et episcopis*; Victorinus: *episcopi*.

37 Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 436.

own comments.<sup>38</sup> Other scholars, including Bauckham, express hard and soft reluctance in presuming that Eusebius' argument in *HE* 3.24.8–13 originated from Papias.<sup>39</sup> Yet in both instances where Bauckham finds reason to believe that Eusebius has dropped his source (*HE* 3.24.8–10; 12–13), he offers no explanation as to why Eusebius chooses the direction that he takes his argument. If Eusebius is indeed inserting additional details into the tradition that lay before him, what are they and why would he have felt compelled to amend his source? The answer is found in what Origen had to say regarding the discrepancies of the gospels in *Comm. Jo.* 10.2.

## 9.2 *HE* 3.24.8b–13 as a Corrective of Origen

Eusebius' argument found in *HE* 3.24.8–13 is a thinly veiled response to Origen's challenge to those who want to claim historical legitimacy to all four Gospel accounts. It is remarkably simple, but thorough enough to provide an explanation of the differences Origen has mentioned.

In *HE* 3.24.11, Eusebius states that John records the period passed over in silence by the Synoptics, and then he specifies that period as being prior to John the Baptist's imprisonment. He mentions the wedding of Cana (Jn. 2:11) as one of these events, with which Origen was clearly concerned as well. Furthermore, in *HE* 3.24.12 he expands the scope of events that are unique to the Gospel of John when he states that, 'Therefore John in his written gospel hands down (παράδιδωσιν) the things accomplished by Christ before John was cast into prison, but the other three evangelists recall (μνημονεύουσιν) the things after the imprisonment of the Baptist.' By implication, this includes John's record of Jesus' first trip to Capernaum, which Origen found to be incompatible with the Synoptics. This means, of course, that John records a trip to Capernaum that is not relayed in the Synoptic accounts. It will be demonstrated below that this is also how Epiphanius later understood and applied Eusebius' testimony (*Haer.* 51.21.14–24), where, in his refutation of the *Alogi*, he states that John records multiple trips of Jesus to Capernaum.

In Eusebius' conclusion (*HE* 3.24.13), it is clear that he is responding to some criticism surrounding apparent discrepancies amongst the gospels. But where does Eusebius get the notion that the gospels are not coherent in regards to the period of time he has just described? If one compares the language Eusebius

38 Ibid., 433.

39 Ibid., 435. See also Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 45–6; cf. Campenhausen, *Formation*, 130–4.



employs with that found in the testimony of Origen, there is good reason to believe that the former is counteracting the latter's views.

Origen repeatedly mentions the discrepancy (διαφωνίαν) of John's account, and he issues a challenge to those who accept the four gospels and suppose this apparent discrepancy (δοκοῦσαν διαφωνίαν) is not to be solved by means of anagogical interpretation (ἀναγωγῆς): they must clear up the difficulties he has raised. It is easy to see how Eusebius' testimony does just this. Indeed, he casts his response in very similar language to that of Origen: 'And if these things are understood (οἷς καὶ ἐπιστήσανατι), no longer do the gospels appear to disagree with one another' (δόξαι διαφωνεῖν ἀλλήλοις τὰ εὐαγγέλια; HE 3.24.13).

Furthermore, Origen's criticism is clearly directed at the *historical* veracity of the four gospels and the 'many other points' at which these gospels do not agree (ἱστορίαν ἀσυμφωνίας; *Comm. Jo.* 10.2). Again in *Comm. Jo.* 10.3 he states that those who believe these gospels are 'history' (ἱστορίαν) will deem it impossible that these four writers are recording truth. Turning to Eusebius' own defence of John, he clearly drops the vocabulary of his written source for that of Origen. In the early portions of his testimony, while reliant on the Papiian tradition, Eusebius refers to the gospels as 'recollections' (ὑπομνήματα; HE 3.24.5), and 'proclamations' (κηρύγματι, κηρύγματος; HE 3.24.7) of the evangelists; but beginning in HE 3.24.8b he adopts the vocabulary of Origen. That is, Eusebius refers to the gospels as 'historical accounts' (ἱστορίας, ἱστορίαν) both at the beginning and end of his argument (HE 3.24.8, 13).

If Eusebius is, in fact, responding to Origen, why does he not mention him? Eusebius was a staunch defender of Origen and likely refrained from referring to him because of his sympathies towards the man, which are seen throughout the sixth book of his *Ecclesiastical History*. Yet Eusebius also is clearly concerned that the four gospels be seen as harmonious. This is apparent in his *Epistula ad Carpianum* to which he subjoined his *Canones*. In a battle for Eusebius' allegiance, the authority and integrity of the gospels have clearly prevailed over the views of Origen, which do not square with Eusebius' own convictions. Eusebius' ten canons, in which he draws parallels between the four gospels, provide ample evidence of his concern for the compatibility of the four gospels. Eusebius' analysis, conjoined with Papias' tradition of the origins of the Gospels, would have made for a tidy account and explanation of the differences and overall compatibility of the Gospels. This may be precisely what we have here in HE 3.24.5–13.



### 9.3 Epiphanius' Appropriation of Eusebius' Rebuttal

Epiphanius utilized Eusebius' testimony in his refutation of the *Alogi*. In particular, there are clear indications that Epiphanius' testimony in *Haer.* 51.21.14–24 is a pillaged form of Eusebius' account in *HE* 3.24.11–13.<sup>40</sup>

As with Eusebius, Epiphanius' response hinges on distinguishing those events that happened before the imprisonment of John the Baptist and those that happened afterwards. He argues, 'For John the Evangelist signals that before the arrest of John the Baptist, the Lord went to him <again> after the days of the temptation. For if John was imprisoned, how did the Savior return to him again at the Jordan? (*Haer.* 51.21.17)<sup>41</sup> Epiphanius proceeds to commandeer the second-half of Eusebius' argument: 'But they did not know that the other three evangelists set out in accurate detail the time after the imprisonment of John the Baptist' (*Haer.* 51.21.18a).

He then chronicles a few of the events recorded in the Gospel of John during this period before the Baptist's imprisonment, all of which happen to be explicitly mentioned by Origen (*Comm. Jo.* 10.2). There was Jesus' first trip to Capernaum (Jn. 2:12; *Haer.* 51.21.19–21),<sup>42</sup> Jesus' cleansing of the Temple (Jn. 2:13–22; *Haer.* 51.21.22–23), and the encounter with Nicodemus (Jn. 3:1–15; *Haer.* 51.21.23). Epiphanius then follows Eusebius in citing John 3:22–24, 'Jesus came along with His disciples to Judea, and spent time there with them and baptized. And John was also <baptizing> in Aenon near Salim, because much water was there, for John was *not yet* cast into prison' (*Haer.* 51.21.24, cf. *HE* 3.24.11; Jn. 3:22–24).

As with Eusebius, Epiphanius emphasizes the fact that John records the deeds of Christ *prior to* the John the Baptist's imprisonment. Other than Eusebius, no other writer prior to Epiphanius makes this particular argument to harmonize the chronology of John with that of the Synoptics. There are other places in Epiphanius' account of the *Alogi* where the fingerprints of Eusebius are discernible as well.<sup>43</sup>

40 Smith ('Gaius,' 403–4) notes this as a distinct possibility, but wrongly suggests that Eusebius' argument for the harmony of the Gospel of John with the Synoptics is aimed at Gaius, not Origen.

41 Here we see Epiphanius carrying forward his argument from earlier in his defence that Jesus and John the Baptist had two separate meetings (cf. *Haer.* 51.13.9–10; cf. *Haer.* 51.4.5–10).

42 The second trip to Capernaum (cf. John 6:16ff.) is noted in *Haer.* 51.21.32, which, Epiphanius emphasizes, is 'in agreement with the other Gospels'.

43 Hill has noted briefly the possible association between *HE* 3.24.5–17 and Epiphanius' testimony, but only in passing. Hill (*Johannine Corpus*, 186, n. 53) lists the following: 51.4.10; 6.5; 12.2; 21.1; 21.18, 24. See also, 'What Papias Said,' 607.

#### 9.4 Eusebius as the Source for the Criticism of Porphyry, Celsus, and Philosabbatius

Epiphanius cites a criticism that he attributes to Porphyry, Celsus and Philosabbatius (*Haer.* 51.8.1–4).<sup>44</sup> This criticism rests on the apparent incompatibility of the events surrounding the birth narrative of Jesus as portrayed by Matthew and Luke. Luke's sequence runs: birth, circumcision eight days later, a pilgrimage to Jerusalem forty days later, and a record of the actions of Simeon and Anna. Matthew, on the other hand, says that an angel appeared to 'him' (Joseph) and told him to go to Egypt, after the arrival of the Magi (Mt. 2:13). The conclusion of these critics, according to Epiphanius, is that Luke must therefore be lying when he says that Mary and Joseph brought Jesus to Jerusalem and returned to Nazareth after forty days (Lk. 2:22, 39). Here again is the criticism:

And so some other Greek philosophers, I mean Porphyry and Celsus and Philosabbatius, who is a dreadful, deceitful snake from the Jews, accuse the facts of the Gospels through the overthrow of the holy apostles; being natural and fleshly, leading their war according to the flesh and, being powerless, they cannot please God; and they have not understood that which is <said> by the Spirit.

For each <of them>, striking against the words of the truth because of the blindness of their ignorance, in their attacks on this say: "How is it possible that the day of his birth in Bethlehem has a circumcision eight days later, and forty days after a journey to Jerusalem and the things Simon and Anna did for him, when on the night he was born it says an angel appeared to him, after the magi had come to worship him and opened the bags and offered him gifts? As it says, 'An angel appeared to him saying, "Get up, take your wife and the child, and go to Egypt, because Herod is looking for the life of the child."' (Mt. 2:13) If he was taken to Egypt on the night he was born, and was there until Herod died, how is it possible that he remained [in Bethlehem] for eight days and be circumcised? Or how is it possible after forty days,<sup>45</sup> as it is found in Luke, who is lying?' They say this blasphemously against each of their own heads, because he says, 'On the fortieth day they brought him to Jerusalem and <returned> into Nazareth.' (cf. Lk. 2:22, 39; *Haer.* 51.8.1–4)<sup>46</sup>

44 Cf. Chapter 6.2.

45 Clearly implying Luke's account of Jesus' journey to Jerusalem.

46 GSC 31,2 *Epiphanius* II, 258.

The search for Epiphanius' source of this criticism has produced varying results, all of which are inconclusive. Naturally, some have suggested it has come from a lost work of one of these critics, while others presume Epiphanius derived this criticism from all three.<sup>47</sup> As Philosabbatius is an otherwise unknown character, it is Celsus and Porphyry who receive due attention. Harnack includes Epiphanius' notice in his catalogue of Porphyrian fragments (Fr. 12).<sup>48</sup> Likewise, J.G. Cook points towards Porphyry as Epiphanius' most probable source.<sup>49</sup> Celsus is perhaps an unlikely candidate, as Origen, in his *Contra Celsum*, only mentions the vague criticism of Celsus regarding the adoration of the Magi and the flight into Egypt (*C. Cels.* 1.58).<sup>50</sup>

In the search for Epiphanius' source, allusions are plentiful, however precise correlations have been difficult to establish. But perhaps there is an answer to the question of Epiphanius' source for this criticism that has gone unnoticed. Turning to Eusebius' work, *Gospel Questions and Answers*, one finds the identical conflict posed between the Matthean and Lukan accounts.<sup>51</sup> In this portion of his work, Eusebius is responding to questions that supposedly originated from a certain Stephanos. The final question that Eusebius records asks rhetorically, 'How is it that Matthew reports that Jesus was brought by His parents from Bethlehem to Egypt, but Luke states that they went to Jerusalem and then to Nazareth?' (*Gospel Questions ad. Stephanos* 16). The similarities between Eusebius and Epiphanius are clear. The same verses are pitted against one another (Mt. 2:13 vs. Lk. 2:22, 39) and the same dilemma of incompatibility is posed. And although one could argue that both Eusebius and Epiphanius were reliant on a shared source, the fact that Epiphanius also repeats the very same response as Eusebius suggests that Epiphanius appropriated this portion of Eusebius' testimony into his account of the *Alogi*.

Eusebius' response is to shift the presumed period of time of which Matthew speaks to a period two years after Jesus' birth. Matthew is recording elements left out of Luke's narrative, and the same is true vice versa. If we juxtapose these two accounts, the links between Epiphanius and Eusebius are undeniable:

47 Smith, 'Gaius,' 382.

48 Harnack, 'Porphyrius, *Gegen die Christen*.'

49 Cook, 137.

50 As noted by Claudio Zamagni (ed.), *Eusèbe de Césarée, Questions Évangéliques, Introduction, Texte Critique, Traduction et Notes*. sc 523 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2008), 184–5, n. 1.

51 Zamagni (184–5) hints at the parallels with Epiphanius, but he sides with Cook (137) in presuming a Porphyrian source.

EUSEBIUS	EPIPHANIUS
( <i>Ad Stephanos Praef. 16</i> ) <i>Problem:</i> Matthew says Jesus and His parents went from Bethlehem to Egypt; Luke states that they went to Jerusalem, then Nazareth.	(51.8.4) <i>Problem:</i> Matthew says, Jesus was taken to Egypt; how can he stay (in Bethlehem)? Luke lies: saying Jesus went to Jerusalem, then Nazareth.
(16.2) <i>Answer:</i> Matthew does not report what Luke does, but records other things ( <i>viz.</i> the Magi).	(51.9.1–2) <i>Answer:</i> Matthew does not cover the same period of time that Luke does—no mention of circumcision or Jesus’ first two years
(16.3) Two years passed between Jesus’ birth and Matthew’s account of the Magi, as seen in Herod’s edict to kill all newborns two years and under (Mt. 2:16).	(51.9.5) Herod ordered the killing of all children two years and younger, thus Jesus was two years old when the Magi came.
(16.4) Mary and Joseph went back to Bethlehem a second time because of the memory (μνήμης) of the miracle of Jesus’ birth.	(51.9.10) Christ’s parents went back to Bethlehem—coming as a sort of memorial (μνήμης) of the events in Bethlehem.
(16.4) The time of the Savior’s birth in Luke is not the same as that in Matthew, when the Magi are encountered.	(51.9.3) Luke describes the events before Jesus was two years old; Matthew speaks of His birth, then speaks of events two years later.
(16.5) The Magi did not find Jesus in the manger, but <i>inside the house</i> with His mother. Thus, it was a later time.	(51.9.12) The Magi entered <i>the house</i> and saw the baby with Mary, no longer in a manger or a cave, but in a house.

Now, questions naturally arise regarding the fact that Eusebius’ work claims to be in response to questions posed by a certain Stephanos, but Epiphanius attributes the source of this criticism as originating from Celsus, Porphyry and Philosabbatius. Nevertheless, the style of criticism found throughout Eusebius’ account is closely related to the attempts by people such as Celsus and Porphyry to find contradictions between Christian texts.<sup>52</sup> As Zamagni notes,

52 ‘The method of looking for contradictions in Biblical narrative is very consistent with Porphyry’s scholarly technique. One cannot claim that Epiphanius preserves an explicit Porphyrian quotation.’ Cook, 137.

the particular method of instruction that Eusebius employs is characteristic of various schools of philosophy during this time, and is noted in, for example, Porphyry's *Life of Plotinus* (*Vita Plot.* 13).<sup>53</sup>

There is also a distinct possibility that Eusebius was directly influenced by the style of Origen, who bridged philosophy and Christianity in a way that pleased Eusebius (cf. *HE* 6.19). A fragment in the catena of Origen's *Commentary on Matthew* provides essentially the same explanation of a two-year disparity between Jesus' birth and the arrival of the Magi. It should be noted, however, that the fragment is attributed to *both* Eusebius and Origen, so its true origins are unknown.<sup>54</sup> Eusebius very well may have appropriated what he read in Origen's work, but it is less plausible to assume that Epiphanius did the same.

Whatever its ultimate source, such a question that emphasizes an apparent discrepancy between Gospel texts in a way that insinuates their unreliability aligns very closely with the style of attack issued by Celsus and Porphyry. It also resonates with a certain Origenist tone. By pitting two Gospels texts against one another to suggest disharmony, it also fits squarely with the nature of criticisms Epiphanius is collecting in his account of the *Alogi*, regardless of the fact that it has nothing to do with the Gospel of John at all. Thus, Epiphanius may very well have used Eusebius' testimony and simply presumed the origin of this argument from this trio of philosophers based on his knowledge of their attempts at discrediting Christianity by attacking the reliability of its honored texts.

## 9.5 Other Connections between Eusebius and Epiphanius

If the lens through which one examines Eusebius' influence on Epiphanius' defence is expanded, there are additional traces of Eusebius' account throughout the witness of the *Alogi*. Eusebius records that the tradition to which he refers says (κατέχει λόγος) that John and Matthew were compelled to write their written memorials 'out of necessity' (ἐπ'ἀνάγκης; *HE* 3.24.5, cf. 3.24.11). Epiphanius uses a similar vocabulary in his record that the Holy Spirit

53 Cf. Zamagni, 33ff. He notes (33), 'En effet, les problèmes qu'Eusèbe soulève sont Presque toujours liés à des contradictions entre différents passages des Évangiles, et non à l'exégèse d'un seul texte, comme il arrive chez Philon.' The influence of certain aspects Hellenistic philosophical thought on Eusebius is also noted by D.S. Wallace-Hadrill, *Eusebius of Caesarea* (London: A.R. Mowbray, 1960), 148ff.

54 See Zamagni, 184–5, n. 1; Frag. 23 in E. Klostermann (ed.), *Origenes Werke. GCS 12,3 Band, III, 1* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs Verlag, 1941), 25.

compelled (ἀναγκάζει) John to write his Gospel (*Haer.* 51.12.2).<sup>55</sup> Hill has rightly noted the fact that John was ‘compelled’ to write his Gospel is broadly attested in other accounts of the origins of the Gospels, but the identity of the party requesting the Gospel to be written is a rather loose variable, perhaps indicating that the tradition, presumably from Papias, stopped short of providing the identity of those making the request. It is certainly not found in Eusebius, where John is only passively described as being compelled to write his Gospel (παράκληθέντα, *HE* 3.24.11). Epiphanius supplants the identity as being the Spirit that compelled John and Matthew (as well as Mark and Luke) to write their Gospels, but other writers supplied their own identities of those who asked John for a written account.<sup>56</sup> The insertion of the various names of those who pressed John to write his Gospel is probably due to the fact that Papias never mentioned them; nevertheless the core tradition shared broadly among the witnesses that John was ‘compelled’ to write his Gospel points back to the tradition of Papias.<sup>57</sup>

Furthermore, as Hill points out, Epiphanius’ notice in *Haer.* 51.6.5 (that John did not wish to repeat what had already been said) has a very Eusebian flavor.<sup>58</sup> This goes hand in hand with another example found in Epiphanius’ description of the purpose behind the writing of the Fourth Gospel. Epiphanius states that John did not need to speak about the things that had already been confirmed, such as his advent (*Haer.* 51.12.3; cf. 51.6.2, 5). He repeats this notice in *Haer.* 51.19.2–5 and adds that John omitted (ἀπεσιώπησεν) nothing essential, but that through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit he spoke of the Divine Word (θεὸν Λόγον). Eusebius says much the same thing: John naturally omitted (ἀποσιωπήσαι) the genealogy because Matthew and Luke had already spoken of this; rather he spoke of the doctrine of his Divinity (θεολογίας) reserved for him by the Divine Spirit (*HE* 3.24.13).

One could also argue that Eusebius’ notices on the Gospels of Luke and Mark also find a home in the testimony of Epiphanius. In his address to Theophilus, Luke claims to have written his ‘orderly account’ since many others have compiled narratives of the ministry of Jesus (Lk. 1:1–4). To this, Eusebius supplements the additional details that Luke thought it ‘necessary to deliver us from

55 Epiphanius makes the same claim later on, arguing that the Holy Spirit compelled (ἀναγκάζει) Luke to write his Gospel (*Haer.* 51.7.1).

56 E.g. the *Muratorian Fragment* (line 10) claims it was John’s fellow disciples (*condiscipulis*) and bishops (*episcopis suis*). Clement of Alexandria states it was John’s acquaintances (γνωρίμων; *HE* 6.14.7).

57 Cf. Bauckham, ‘Papias,’ 62; Hill, ‘What Papias Said,’ 596–7.

58 Hill, *Johannine Corpus*, 186, n. 53.

other contested ideas' (*HE* 3.24.15). Epiphanius makes a very similar point, although he specifies that the Holy Spirit compelled Luke to raise up their (*viz.* Cerinthus et al.; cf. *Haer.* 51.7.3, 51.20.4–5) misguided understanding from the lowest depths (*Haer.* 51.7.1–3). With regard to Mark, Eusebius is the first to mention in his account of the Gospels that Mark was sent to Egypt after writing his Gospel (*HE* 2.16.1). Likewise, Epiphanius preserves this information in his own account (*Haer.* 51.6.10).<sup>59</sup>

### Summary

Epiphanius was not the only one to disagree with Origen's position that the Gospel of John could not be considered an accurate record of history. Using the testimony of Papias as his platform, Eusebius provides a response to Origen's demand for an explanation of how the apparent discrepancies between John and the Synoptics are to be reconciled. For his part, Epiphanius used Eusebius' justification in his own rebuttal against the criticisms of the so-called *Alogi*. He also borrowed the criticism and response found in Eusebius' *Gospel Questions and Answers*, which he then attributed to known Gospel critics. These examples in addition to other Eusebian features throughout the account of the *Alogi* solidify the fact that the 'Father of Church History' played an important role in Epiphanius' construction of this composite heretical sect.

---

59 Jerome would later preserve this notice as well (*De vir. ill.* 8).

## Sources Behind the *Alogi*'s Objections to the Apocalypse

From which source(s) did Epiphanius derive the criticisms against the Apocalypse? Whereas it is possible to determine the source for the *Alogi*'s criticisms against the Gospel of John, there is no extant literature prior to Epiphanius that records any identical objections to those concerning John's Apocalypse. As such, the answer to the question is inherently open-ended, but not without possible explanations. Some hypotheses, however, are more plausible than others. This chapter examines the possible sources behind the criticisms of the *Alogi* against the Apocalypse. Two of the earliest extant sources that raise serious hermeneutical objections to the Apocalypse are Origen and Dionysius of Alexandria, and given Epiphanius' use of the former in the objections to the Gospel of John, it is not surprising that he likely used Origen and his protégé as the sources for the criticisms of the Apocalypse by the *Alogi*.

### *The Objections to the Apocalypse of John*

#### *Objection 1*

And again these people are not ashamed to take up arms against the things said by Saint John, believing that they are able to overturn the truth, but being unaware that they are attacking themselves rather than sound teachings. For they say mockingly of the Apocalypse, "What use is it to me, he says (τί μνη, φησὶν), when the Apocalypse of John tells me about seven angels and seven trumpets?"—not knowing that such things were essential and profitable to the correctness of the proclamation (*Haer.* 51.32.1–3; cf. Rev. 8:2).<sup>1</sup>

#### *Objection 2*

Again some of them attack the following text in the Apocalypse and say in contradiction that, "He said, in a contradiction, 'Write to the angel of the church that is in Thyatira,' and there is no church of Christians in

<sup>1</sup> GCS 31,2 *Epiphanius II*, 305.



Thyatira. How then did he write to a church that does not exist?" In fact these people destroy themselves since they are compelled by their own declarations to confess the truth. For if they say, "There is now no church in Thyatira," they show that this was foretold by John.

For since those who are of the Phrygians settled there [and] grabbed the minds of the simple believers like wolves, and converted the whole area to their heresy, those that reject the Apocalypse attacked this text at that time in an effort to discredit it (*Haer.* 51.33.1–3; *Rev.* 2:18).<sup>2</sup>

### *Objection 3*

But again these people get excited in their boundless hunt for texts to give the notion of throwing out the books of the holy apostle—I mean the Gospel and Apocalypse of John (and perhaps the Epistles also, for these are also in accord with the Gospel and Apocalypse)—and they say (φασιν) that, "I saw, and he said to the angel, 'Loose the four angels that are upon the Euphrates.' And I heard the number of the host, ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands, and they had been fortified in breastplates of fire and sulfur and hyacinth" (*Rev.* 9:14–17). For these people considered that the truth might somehow be <a kind of> joke (*Haer.* 51.34.1–3a).<sup>3</sup>

## 10.1 The Reception of the Apocalypse Prior to Epiphanius

Initially, the Johannine Apocalypse was warmly received among a number of early Christian writers. Papias cites it,<sup>4</sup> as do other writers such as Melito of Sardis (*HE* 4.26.2), Apollonius (*HE* 5.18.14) and Theophilus of Antioch (*Ad Autolycum* 2.28; *HE* 4.24.1).<sup>5</sup> It is celebrated as the work of John the apostle in the writings of Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 81), Irenaeus (*AH* 4.20.11)<sup>6</sup> and Tertullian (*Adv. Marcion* 3.24). None of these writings, however, mention anything that

<sup>2</sup> *GCS* 31,2 *Epiphanius II*, 306–7.

<sup>3</sup> *GCS* 31,2 *Epiphanius II*, 308–9.

<sup>4</sup> See fragments 10, 11 and 24 in J.B. Lightfoot, J.R. Harmer and M.W. Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998), 313–14, 318–19.

<sup>5</sup> See A.C. Sundberg, Jr., 'Canon Muratori: A Fourth-Century List,' *HTR* 66 (1973), 23–4. Sundberg notes that Andreas of Caesarea (*in Apoc.* 34) also suggests that Papias used it.

<sup>6</sup> Here, John is referred to as the Lord's disciple, not as an 'apostle'.

approximates the anti-literal hermeneutical approach to the Apocalypse, or its attribution to Cerinthus.

For his part, Hippolytus accepts the Apocalypse as written by John the apostle (*Ant.* 36), and he comments on it throughout his *Commentary on Daniel* and *De Antichristo*. Later sources attribute Hippolytus with another commentary, now lost, entitled *De Apocalypsi*. There is also the title of the lost work concerning the Gospel and Apocalypse of John that is listed on the statue of Hippolytus, and the *Apology* for the same works noted by Ebed-Jesu. The purpose, contents and historical existence of any lost work of Hippolytus are unknown. As with the sources noted above, the extant Hippolytan corpus does not provide any parallels with the nature of the *Alogi*'s criticisms or that Cerinthus was charged as the author of this work. Hippolytus does mention Cerinthus in his *Refutatio* (7.21–23; 10.21), but he provides no information to suggest that this heretic and the Johannine literature are in any way connected or confused with one another. Furthermore, the author of the *Muratorian Fragment* accepts the Apocalypse of John without qualification.

Origen also accepts the Apocalypse as canonical and certifiably Johannine (*Comm. Jo.* 2.4; *De Princip.* 1.2.10, 4.1.25; *C. Cels.* 6.6.6; *HE* 6.25.7–10). He notes in his *Commentary on Matthew* his intention to write a commentary on the Apocalypse, and Didymus the Blind claims knowledge of such a work;<sup>7</sup> however, if Origen did write such a work it has not survived in tact. There are, however, thirty-nine scholia on the Apocalypse discovered by the Greek scholar C. Diobouniotis and attributed to Origen by A. Harnack.<sup>8</sup> Some have questioned their authenticity;<sup>9</sup> however, they possess some of the hallmark features that are intrinsic to Origen's hermeneutic such that Harnack's argument in favor of them being from Origen remains the most plausible

7 See Weinrich, xxi, who notes the record of Didymus in *sc* 83, 123 and 84, 654–5.

8 Constantin Diobouniotis and Adolf von Harnack, *Der Scholien-kommentar zur Apokalypse Johannis nebst einem Stück aus Irenaeus, Lib. v, Graece. TU* 38, 3. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1911. See also the later revisions by C.H. Turner in two articles, 'The Text of the Newly Discovered Scholia of Origen on the Apocalypse,' *JTS* 13 (1912): 386–97; also, 'Origen Scholia in Apocalypsin,' *JTS* 25 (1924), 1–16.

9 In particular, as noted by E.J. Goodspeed ('Recent Patristic Literature,' *AJT* 20, n. 1 [1916], 116), Harnack's argument (*Scholien-kommentar*, 50) the conclusion that Origen is directly identified in Scholion xxiv could be wiped away with a small change in accentuation (*viz.* changing ὡς οὐ for Ὡ σοῦ), as originally noted by J.A.T. Robinson, 'Origen's Comments on the Apocalypse,' *JTS* 13 (1911), 296. However, Goodspeed maintains that this work is probably still from Origen even though no explicit attestation of his authorship is found in the Scholia themselves. Likewise, Robinson does not claim that the scholia are from anyone other than Origen.

explanation. As detailed below, aspects of these scholia have parallels with the way in which Epiphanius reports the accusations of the *Alogi* against the Apocalypse. Finally, there is a Latin text of an Irish Commentary containing various homilies on the Apocalypse. J.F.T. Kelly suggests that these came from Origen,<sup>10</sup> but questions abound, particularly since Origen is mentioned for the first time in the prologue of only one manuscript of this very homiletical work, dated to the eighth century.

Later, Victorinus of Pettau wrote a *Commentary on the Apocalypse*.<sup>11</sup> According to Jerome, who revised this work's chiliastic views, Victorinus replicated the anagogical hermeneutics of Origen (*Ep.* 61.2). This may be seen throughout Victorinus' commentary, although he also demonstrates reliance upon Hippolytus and Irenaeus. Even if Victorinus' *Commentary on the Apocalypse* does reflect some of Origen's views, nothing in his work aligns with the criticisms of the *Alogi* or makes any note of Cerinthus.<sup>12</sup>

As time went on the place of John's Apocalypse in the list of accepted writings became more volatile, particularly along the eastern region of the Mediterranean.<sup>13</sup> The clearest point at which it began to be heavily scrutinized came by way of Dionysius of Alexandria (ca. 265) in his work *On the Promises*. As noted above, Dionysius deemed the work to be acceptable, but only when interpreted spiritually (*HE* 7.25.4–5). After a careful exegetical analysis of the Apocalypse in comparison to the authenticity of the Gospel of John, the differences in content and vocabulary caused him to deny the author of the former was John the Apostle, the son of Zebedee (*HE* 7.25.7), though he refuses to reject it or attribute it to Cerinthus, as 'some' before him had done. He suggests rather that it may have come from a different 'John' (*HE* 7.25.9–27).

Later, Eusebius affirms Dionysius' view that it may have been written by another 'John' (*HE* 3.39.6; cf. 3.25.4), and his suspicions of its chiliastic teachings are well known.<sup>14</sup> By the middle of the fourth century, Cyril of Jerusalem had chosen not to include it in his canonical list (*Catech.* 4.36); nor did it make

10 J.F.T. Kelly, 'Early Medieval Evidence for Twelve Homilies by Origen on the Apocalypse,' *vc* 39, n. 3 (Sept. 1985): 273–9.

11 M. Dulaey (ed.), *Victorin de Poetovio: Sur l'Apocalypse et autres écrits*. sc 423 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1997).

12 M. Dulaey has attempted to decipher what elements of this work appear to be derived from Origen in *Victorin de Poetovio: Premier exégète Latin*. 2 Vols. Collection des Etudes Augustiniennes 139, 140. (Paris: Institut d'études Augustiniennes, 1993), 288–93; 295–99. Cf. Weinrich, xxii.

13 Stephen Davis, 'Introducing an Arabic Commentary on the Apocalypse: Ibn Kâtib Qaysar on Revelation,' *HTR* 101 (Jan. 2008), 78.

14 See esp. Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian*, 131ff.

the contemporary lists of Gregory of Nazianzus (*Carmen* 1.1.12.39), the *Apostolic Constitutions* (7.47.85) or the Syriac Peshitta.<sup>15</sup>

Finally, in the last quarter of the same century, Epiphanius demonstrates his own ambivalence towards the Apocalypse of John. At the beginning of his account of the *Alogi*, he makes it clear that he would understand if these heretics only rejected Apocalypse of John (*Haer.* 51.3.4). The fact that he devotes such an insignificant portion of his testimony to defending the Apocalypse suggests his lack of any real concern for this work.<sup>16</sup>

Thus, while John's Apocalypse retained much of its positive status in the west, there is a discernibly less-than-enthusiastic reception over time in the east.<sup>17</sup> Out of all these witnesses, those with the clearest parallels to Epiphanius' account are Dionysius of Alexandria and Origen. From Eusebius it is known that Dionysius' *On the Promises* is, at least in part, an examination of the entire Apocalypse in an effort to demonstrate that it is impossible to understand literally (*HE* 7.25.6). It is well known that his predecessor and mentor, Origen, advocates a spiritual hermeneutic as well. Much of the Origen's scholia on the Apocalypse reflect the style of criticism that the *Alogi* had against the Apocalypse. In fact, the parallels between the views of Origen and Dionysius of Alexandria as well as the *Alogi* are close enough to suggest that the criticisms of the *Alogi* against the Apocalypse fit squarely within the hermeneutical strategy of both of these writers.

In light of the preceding chapters where Origen's fingerprints are clearly seen in the objections to the Gospel of John, it is not surprising to find that he may have also influenced Epiphanius' account of the *Alogi's* criticisms of the Apocalypse. Furthermore, the statements of Origen's protégé, Dionysius of Alexandria, have direct parallels with Epiphanius' account, particularly in his notice pertaining to the attribution of the Apocalypse to Cerinthus.

It is true that by appealing to these works any conclusion must presume the content of works that are no longer fully extant—a methodological leap of which I have been very critical so far. There are, however, important distinctions to be drawn between the contents of a hypothetical work of Hippolytus and that which may be gleaned from the accounts of Origen and Dionysius. If Harnack is correct that the scholia are truly Origenian, then these fragments further elucidate his views on the Apocalypse. Moreover, even though Eusebius reproduces only part of Dionysius' *On the Promises*, that which he does

15 See Davis, 78–9; Sundberg, 24–5.

16 Less than ten per cent of his account of the *Alogi* concerns the Apocalypse. Epiphanius addresses the criticisms of the Apocalypse only in *Haer.* 51.32–4.

17 Davis, 79.

preserve as well as Eusebius' own comments about this work provide valuable portals into its content. Thus, although it is imperative to proceed with caution, that which remains of these works provides is adequate to examine the parallels between these sources and Epiphanius' *Alogi*.

## 10.2 Origen and the Apocalypse

Although Origen accepts the Apocalypse, he is quick to denounce those who understand it literally. For example, in his work *De Principiis* (2.11), Origen issues a scathing critique of those who conceive of the promises of the future millennium in this way. Such interpreters, are wrong to understand this text 'in a Jewish manner',<sup>18</sup> adopting a superficial view of the letter of the law (*De Princ.* 2.11.2). Throughout this work Origen is responding to chiliastic views in such a way that, as Hill notes, 'His onslaught is practically merciless, as he scolds the literalists . . . for being too lazy to use their heads and too hospitable to their carnal impulses.'<sup>19</sup> He condemns those who understand the promises as referring to things of this life, as though what exists now will exist again in the future. This is also a primary concern of Dionysius of Alexandria in his work, *On the Promises* (*HE* 7.24.5).<sup>20</sup>

There are numerous instances throughout Origen's works where he claims that the literal sense of Scripture simply cannot be true.<sup>21</sup> It is seen in his scholia on the Apocalypse, and in some important instances there are parallels with what Epiphanius says about the opinions of the *Alogi*. For example, Origen interprets the 'voice of the trumpet' (Rev. 4:1) spiritually as 'the magnitude of understanding with perspicuity that came to [John].'<sup>22</sup> Similarly, the first objection of the *Alogi* finds no literal value in the notice about the trumpets (*Haer.* 51.32.2). Elsewhere, regarding Rev. 2:21 Origen speaks of Jezebel as one who had a 'damned nature'.<sup>23</sup> It is interesting to note how Epiphanius interprets this passage differently in his response to the second objection of the *Alogi* to the Apocalypse. Here, he downplays the promiscuity of Jezebel in Rev. 2:21, choosing rather to emphasize her role as a prophetess in Rev. 2:20 (*Haer.* 51.33.8) in order to draw a parallel with the Montanist prophetesses:

18 Cf. Hanson, *Allegory and Event*, 237.

19 Hill, *Regnum Caelorum*, 177.

20 Ibid., n. 5.

21 For a number of examples, see Hanson, *Allegory and Event*, 239–41.

22 See Diobouniotis and Harnack, frag. xxv, 32; cf. Hanson, 343–4.

23 Diobouniotis and Harnack, frag. xvii, 29.

'Do you not see, that he is speaking about the women about whom he means the prophets who are deceived and deceiving others; I mean Priscilla, Maximilla and Quintilla.'<sup>24</sup>

Moreover, similarities between Origen and Epiphanius' testimony might be seen with the criticism regarding the lack of any Church in Thyatira. As noted in Chapter 5, Origen notes that 'Bethany' in Jn. 1:28 should actually be rendered 'Bethabara' (*Comm. Jo.* 6.24). In the same passage he also notes that the town of 'Gergesa' should actually be called 'Gerasa'. Origen demonstrates his awareness of, and concern with, Christian geography such that the fact that there was no Church in Thyatira would be something in which he would have been interested.

It is true that none of the scholia of Origen on the Apocalypse directly parallels the objections of the *Alogi*, but those fragments that have survived provide an important indication of his overall perspective. If one broadens the scope of the present analysis, it is possible to detect additional connections between the accusations of the *Alogi* and the views of Origen. Most notably, the *Alogi*'s objections do not convey any real attempt to disprove the authenticity of the Apocalypse, nor do they resonate with the style of criticisms one would find in a polemical work. They are, in the words of J. Gwynn, the musings of a 'captious critic', which is a charge that could be levelled against Origen's attempts to demonstrate the points in Scripture where it is incapable of being understood literally. Indeed, the criticisms of the *Alogi* are targeted against a literal understanding of Scripture, such as what is found throughout Origen's commentaries (and perhaps Dionysius' comments which are known only through Eusebius' gloss [*HE* 7.25.6]). They are exactly the type of criticisms Origen would raise to argue that it should not be interpreted literally.

Thus, although these scholia bear only indirect parallels with the criticisms of the *Alogi*, it is conceivable that Origen's hermeneutical methodology influenced Epiphanius, particularly if Epiphanius had a full copy of this work. However, Origen does not associate in any way Cerinthus with the Apocalypse, nor does he mention any call to reject it. Yet Origen's views would have influenced those of his student, Dionysius of Alexandria, who not only mentions the arch-heretic but also endeavored to show how it was unintelligible when read literally. In fact, W.H.C. Frend has suggested the possibility that an Origenian work on the Apocalypse may be behind the comments made by Dionysius.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>24</sup> *GCS* 31,2 *Epiphanius* II, 308.

<sup>25</sup> See Kelly (278), who notes that Frend made this comment in regards to Origen's supposed work, *Homilies on the Apocalypse*; although given the examples from the scholia it is possible that this may have also born some influence as well.

### 10.3 Dionysius of Alexandria and the Apocalypse

Undoubtedly, the clearest and most viable connection between Epiphanius' testimony regarding the Apocalypse and the early extant literature is the testimony of Dionysius of Alexandria. In *HE* 7.25, Dionysius takes an identical position to that of Origen concerning a literal interpretation of the Apocalypse. It is wrong to think that there will be a thousand years of bodily pleasures that will contain eating and drinking and marrying in an earthly Jerusalem (*HE* 7.25.1–3). But Dionysius differs from his mentor on a few crucial points. Most notably, he attributes this view to Cerinthus; Origen does not. This is how Eusebius records the words of Dionysius:

Some before us (τινὲς . . . πρὸ ἡμῶν) have set aside (ἡθέτησαν) and dismantled (ἀνεσκεύασαν) the whole book, amending (διεθύνοντες) each chapter, and displaying it as unintelligible (ἄγνωστον) and illogical (ἀσθλλόγιστον), and maintaining that the title is a lie. For they say (λέγουσιν) that it is not from John, nor is it a revelation because it is covered thickly and deeply by a curtain of ignorance (ἄγνοίας). And they say that none of the apostles, neither the saints, nor anyone in the church wrote it, but that Cerinthus, who founded the sect, which is called the Cerinthians after him, desiring trustworthy authority for his own forgeries, assigned the name. (*HE* 7.25.1–2)<sup>26</sup>

In his following statements, Dionysius is careful not to reject the Apocalypse just because he does not understand its meaning. Even though he sets out to prove it cannot be understood literally, he is convinced that there is a concealed, deeper meaning behind the words (*HE* 7.25.4). After this statement, Eusebius breaks from his citation of Dionysius' work to offer his own summary of its contents. 'After these things he [Dionysius] examined closely (βασανίσας) the entire book of the Apocalypse. And he has shown that it is not possible to understand it literally' (*HE* 7.25.6).<sup>27</sup> Unfortunately, this brief summary is all that is known of the contents of this portion of his work.

There are two distinct critical analyses of Revelation mentioned in Dionysius' testimony. On the one hand, Dionysius mentions those that came before him who rejected it as a forgery of Cerinthus (*HE* 7.25.1–3). Nothing is known of the actual contents of this work, nor does Dionysius agree with their views. Rather, in light of these prior accusations Dionysius provides his own

<sup>26</sup> GCS 6,2, 690.

<sup>27</sup> GCS 6,2, 692.



analysis of the Apocalypse. Sadly, there is no recourse but to take Eusebius at his word when he says that Dionysius' analysis proved that it is impossible to understand it literally.

Nevertheless, all of the necessary ingredients for Epiphanius' description of the *Alogi*'s views of the Apocalypse are present. Not only is this the first instance where it is charged that this work was written by Cerinthus, it is clear that Dionysius could not endorse a literal interpretation. It is possible that Epiphanius had access to the source Dionysius references, however, because Dionysius' hermeneutics were similar to Origen's, the work *On the Promises* may have been all that Epiphanius needed.

Furthermore, there are other traces in Epiphanius' account of the *Alogi* that may bolster the likelihood that he was pulling from the record of Dionysius. As noted earlier, Hill has suggested Epiphanius may have been inspired to name this heresy the '*Alogi*' based on Dionysius' statement that those before him declared the Apocalypse 'unintelligible' (ἄγνωστον) and 'illogical' (ἄσυλλόγιστον).<sup>28</sup> Moreover, a few lines after Epiphanius introduces this sect as the Ἄλογοι, he addresses the question of whether or not John the apostle is the true author of these works.

For they allege as an excuse, being ashamed to speak against St. John on account of [their] knowledge that he was one of the apostles and the Lord's beloved, who rightly revealed mysteries to him who reclined on [the Lord's] breast, these people attempt to overturn [him] for other reasons. For they say that they are not from John, but Cerinthus, and they say that they are not worthy to be in the Church (*Haer.* 51.3.6).<sup>29</sup>

This could most certainly be applied to those who, according to Dionysius, attributed the Apocalypse to Cerinthus. But Epiphanius also makes it clear that the *Alogi* also knew that John the Apostle wrote it, yet they 'make excuses' for why they cannot accept it. Dionysius' lengthy argument to prove that John the apostle was *not* the author of the Apocalypse (*HE* 7.25.7–27) certainly fits this description.

There is one other tangential piece of evidence that links Dionysius and Epiphanius. Dionysius is the first to mention Cerinthus' sect as 'Cerinthian'

<sup>28</sup> Hill, *Johannine Corpus*, 187: '... the alpha-privative adjectives they used to slander John's Apocalypse could have given Epiphanius the idea for his pejorative Ἄλογοι.

<sup>29</sup> *GCS* 31,2 *Epiphanius II*, 251.



(Κηρυθιανήν; *HE* 3.28.4; 7.25.2).<sup>30</sup> Epiphanius repeats this title elsewhere in his *Panarion* (cf. *Haer.* 28.1.1, 8.1).

Given that there is no surviving copy of Dionysius' *On the Promises*, it is impossible to know for certain that this was Epiphanius' source. Nevertheless, the nature of the criticisms of the Apocalypse recorded by Epiphanius fit squarely within the hermeneutical milieu of Dionysius and his mentor, Origen. Moreover, Dionysius is the first to mention the fact that some believed John's Apocalypse to be a Cerinthian forgery. It is also conceivable that just as Epiphanius had a limited knowledge concerning Irenaeus' comments about an anonymous group that rejected the Gospel of John (*AH* 3.11.9), and filled in the details with the criticisms of Origen, he have done with same with Dionysius' comments concerning another anonymous group rejected the Apocalypse as the work of Cerinthus and used this as the foundation for the latter part of his testimony.

### Summary

Although there is early evidence that links the Apocalypse with Cerinthus, nowhere prior to Epiphanius is there any mention of Cerinthus being the author of the Gospel of John. Epiphanius has amalgamated the testimony of Irenaeus (*AH* 3.11.9) concerning the Gospel of John with the words of Dionysius of Alexandria (*HE* 7.25.1–4) on the Apocalypse, in addition to a variety of other sources I have discussed in the previous chapters. Although each of these testimonies is a contributing factor to his description of the *Alogi*, independently none of them fully reflects all of the characteristics that Epiphanius attributes to this heretical sect. Rather, Epiphanius has incorporated Dionysius' comments into the broader category of the *Alogi* in which Cerinthus is now falsely claimed to be the author of both the Apocalypse and Gospel of John.

---

30 Klijn and Reinink (8) wrongly state that Epiphanius was the first to provide this title.

## Conclusion

The heresy known as the *Alogi* has had enormous influence on scholarship over the past century, especially its central role within the 'Johannine Controversy'. According to modern estimations, this ecclesiastical group, spearheaded by the Roman presbyter-bishop Gaius of Rome, almost succeeded in eradicating the entire Johannine corpus from the canon of scripture. It is a compelling and fascinating theory that, for over a century, has steered scholarly discussions on the role and value of the Johannine materials in the early church. There is, however, one very significant problem: the *Alogi* never existed.

Despite all the attention that has been paid to lost sources and hypothetical encounters, there is no evidence that indicates that any of the early Church Fathers knew anything about the so-called *Alogi*. The extant works of the great heresiologists Irenaeus and Hippolytus make no mention of such a group. Tertullian, Origen, Dionysius of Alexandria and Eusebius are all equally ignorant of the *Alogi*. It is only from the hand of Epiphanius that one first hears of this heresy that supposedly existed during the time of many of these early Church Fathers.

It is true that Epiphanius composed his account based on materials in his library. However, the search for Epiphanius' source(s) has produced results that vary drastically from the prevailing notion, which holds that he derived all his information on the *Alogi* from a lost work of Hippolytus. In contrast to a single-source hypothesis, it is clear that he has borrowed from a number of works written by various ecclesiastical luminaries that preceded him. A careful examination of his testimony reveals that his account of the *Alogi* is a multilateral attack on a variety of critics of the four-fold Gospel, such as Celsus, Porphyry, Philosabbatius, the Valentinians, the Ebionites and Cerinthus. As such, it is not a history and refutation of a singular group with a defined set of ideas and beliefs. Rather, Epiphanius pulls from a number of his predecessors' testimonies to create this heretical group.

Most notably, Epiphanius utilizes Irenaeus' testimony concerning an anonymous group that rejected the Johannine Paraclete (AH 3.11.9) as the foundational source in his construction of this heresy. Epiphanius clearly conceives of the *Alogi* in similar terms as Irenaeus' *Alīi*, but his direct knowledge of these Johannine assailants was limited by Irenaeus' silence. Because the latter is not forthcoming on any specifics of this group, Epiphanius filled in the blanks by assembling a list of usual suspects.

Thus, the *Alogi*'s objections to the Gospel of John ultimately belong to Origen, the theological nemesis of Epiphanius. In his *Commentary on John*,

Origen emphasized the apparent discrepancies between John's Gospel and the generally harmonious record of the Synoptic Gospels. These are his own views; there is absolutely no evidence to suggest that Origen's criticisms came to him by way of Gaius' *Dialogue with Proclus* or via Hippolytus. As I have demonstrated, Epiphanius was incensed by Origen's argument that the Gospels—especially the Gospel of John—do not reflect an accurate history and therefore must not have been written by a divine spirit. He was also enraged at Origen's solution to this problem, which required that one must interpret the Gospels spiritually. For these sins, Epiphanius made Origen the mouthpiece of the *Alogi*.

Epiphanius utilized a number of different sources in his efforts to answer Origen's demands for an explanation of how all four Gospels can be proven to be historically reliable. The structure of Epiphanius' defense parallels the tradition of Papias concerning the origins of the Gospels. In the same way, Eusebius recognized the problems associated with Origen's criticisms of the Johannine chronology, and responded by blending his own opinions with what Papias had to say about John's Gospel. Eusebius' testimony ultimately found its way into Epiphanius' testimony.

Epiphanius' record of the *Alogi*'s objections to the Apocalypse also originates from the hermeneutical perspective of Origen and Dionysius of Alexandria. As with the objections to the Gospel of John, those against the Apocalypse exploit the difficulties in a literal exegesis, which find parallels in the remaining fragments of Origen's scholia on the Apocalypse along with that which Eusebius preserves of Dionysius' *On the Promises*. In addition, Dionysius is the first to report that 'some' before him claimed that the heretic Cerinthus was the true author of the Apocalypse of John.

What is conspicuously absent from Epiphanius' account of the *Alogi* is any hint that the *Alogi* were responding to the threat of Montanism, nor are there any direct or indirect ties to Gaius of Rome. For his part, Gaius was not a heretical adversary of the Johannine corpus, nor was he the leader or only constituent of the *Alogi*. The later testimonies of Dionysius bar Salibi and Ebed-Jesu claim that a certain 'Gaius' maintained nearly identical views as the *Alogi*, however, when their accounts are carefully scrutinized it is clear that they do not accurately reflect the history that came centuries earlier.

Most notably, the *Caius haereticus* of the bar Salibi commentaries is incompatible with the historical figure Gaius of Rome. This is seen throughout bar Salibi's account, where he gives no indication that he is aware of Gaius' provenance in Rome or his battle against the Montanists that took the form of a *Dialogue* against Proclus. As I have argued, the 'Gaius' of the bar Salibi commentaries is based on the faulty interpretation of the bare figure of Eusebius'

account in *HE* 3.28.1–2. Rather than the ‘ecclesiastical’ man of Eusebius’ time, bar Salibi has misunderstood Gaius as the opponent of the Apocalypse and, with the supporting testimony of Epiphanius, the Gospel of John. Rather than the ‘learned’ man of Eusebius’ era whose reputation grew posthumously into one of orthodox and intellectual prestige, bar Salibi’s Gaius is attributed with charges against the Apocalypse that more accurately reflect the style of Origenian hermeneutical questions concerning textual integrity.

Finally, in all of the questions surrounding the history, theology, constituency and provenance of the *Alogi*, it is critically important to understand the way in which Epiphanius conceives of ‘heresy’. His concern for theological propriety in accordance with Nicene orthodoxy steers his conviction that any deviation from this standard warrants his condemnation, regardless of whether or not certain sects ever existed in any historical sense.

In the closing statements of his account of the *Alogi*, Epiphanius triumphantly claims to have crushed the errors of this sect. In typical Epiphanian fashion, he sees his own response to these erroneous views as more than sufficient for its eradication. Epiphanius likens every heresy in the *Panarion* to a particular wild beast or snake-like creature, and his choice for the *Alogi* is particularly appropriate, as he refers to an insignificant creature that is comprised of different component parts unified into one body. Thus, I conclude with the final lines of Epiphanius’ testimony of the *Alogi*, for I believe he deserves the last word. ‘It is similar to a woodlouse or a poisonous millipede that has many feet, but it is not strong and its poison does not inflict much pain. It has an elongated body with many feet, and by the power of God and truth, I have trampled it’ (*Haer.* 51.35.4).

# Bibliography

- Abbot, E. 'The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel: External Evidences.' In *The Fourth Gospel and its Authorship*, edited by J.H. Thayer, 3–106. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1892.
- Achelis, H. 'Hippolyt's kleinere exegetische und homiletische Schriften.' *GCS* 1 (1897): 241–247.
- . 'Hippolytstudien.' *TU* Heft 4 Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1897.
- Amar, J.P., trans. *Dionysius Bar Salibi: A Response to the Arabs. cSCO Scriptores Syri* T. 239, Vol. 615, Versio. Leuven: Peeters, 2005.
- Ashe, G. *The Virgin*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1976.
- Assemani, J.S. *Bibliotheca Orientalis Clementino-Vaticana*, 111/1. Rome: S.C. Propaganda Fide, 1719–1728.
- Ayers, L. *Nicaea and Its Legacy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Baarda, T. 'Διαφωνία—Συμφωνία, Factors in the Harmonization of the Gospels Especially in the Diatessaron of Tatian.' In *Essays on the Diatessaron*, edited by T. Baarda, A. van der Kooij and A.S. van der Woude, 29–47. Kampen, the Netherlands: Pharos, 1999.
- . 'A staff only, not a stick' *Disharmony of the Gospels and the Harmony of Tatian* (Matthew 10:9f, Mark 6:8f, Luke 9:3 and 10:4). In *Essays on the Diatessaron*, edited by T. Baarda, A. van der Kooij and A.S. van der Woude, 173–96. Kampen, the Netherlands: Pharos, 1999.
- Bacon, B.W. *The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate: A Series of Essays on Problems Concerning the Origin and Value of the Anonymous Writings Attributed to the Apostle John*. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1910.
- Baird, William. *History of New Testament Research*. 2 vols. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992–2003.
- Bardy, Gustave. 'Cerinthe.' *Rbib* 30 (1921): 344–373.
- Barnes, Timothy D. 'The Chronology of Montanism.' *JTS* 21 (1970): 403–8.
- . *Constantine and Eusebius*. London: Harvard University Press, 1981.
- . *Early Christianity and the Roman Empire*. London: Variorum Reprints, 1984.
- . 'Porphyry Against the Christians: Date and the Attribution of Fragments.' *JTS* 24 (1973): 424–42.
- . "Sossianus Hierocles and the Antecedents of the 'Great Persecution'." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 80 (1976): 239–52.
- . *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.
- Barrett, C.K. *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*. London: SPCK, 1955.

- . *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*. 2nd ed. London: SPCK, 1978.
- . *The Gospel of John and Judaism: The Franz Delitzsch Lectures, University of Münster, 1967*. London: SPCK, 1975.
- Bartlet, Vernon. "'Papias' 'Exposition': Its Date and Contents." In *Amicitiae Corolla. A Volume of Essays Presented to James Rendel Harris, D. Litt. On the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday*, edited by H.G. Wood, 15–44. London: University of London Press, 1933.
- Bauckham, Richard. 'Papias and Polycrates on the Origin of the Fourth Gospel.' *JTS* 44 (1993): 24–69.
- . *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Bauer, Walter. *Das Johannesevangelium*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1925.
- . *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1934. English Translation, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*. Edited by Robert A. Kraft and Gerhard Krodel. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.
- Benko, Stephen. *The Virgin Goddess: Studies in Pagan and Christian Roots of Mariology*. Studies in the History of Religions LIX. Leiden: Brill, 1993.
- Blanc, Cécile. *Origène. Commentaire sur Saint Jean, t. 1: Livres I–v. Texte Grec, Avant-Propos, Traduction et Notes*. SC 120. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1966.
- . *Origène. Commentaire sur Saint Jean, t. 11: Livres VI et X. Texte Grec Avant-Propos, Traduction et Notes*. SC 157. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1970.
- Bludau, August. *Die ersten Gegner der Johannesschriften*. Biblische Studien 22. Freiburg: Herder and Co., 1925.
- Bousset, Wilhelm. *Die Offenbarung Johannis*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1906.
- Braun, F.-M. *Jean le Théologien et son Évangile dans l'église ancienne*. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1959.
- Brent, Allen. *Hippolytus and the Roman Church in the Third Century: Communities in Tension before the Emergence of a Monarch-Bishop*. VCSupp 31. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- . *The Imperial Cult and the Development of Church Order: Concepts and Images of Authority in Paganism and Early Christianity Before the Age of Cyprian*. Boston: Brill, 1999.
- Brock, Sebastian. *Catalog of Syriac Fragments (New Finds) In the Library of the Monastery of Saint Catherine, Mount Sinai*. Athens: Mount Sinai Foundation, 1995.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Epistles of John*. New York: Doubleday, 1982.
- Buchanan, E.S. 'The Codex Muratorianus.' *JTS* 8 (1908), 537–545.
- Camerlynck, Achilleus. *De Quarti Evangelii auctore dissertatio*. Lovanii: J. van Linthout, 1899.

- Cameron, Averil. 'The Cult of the Virgin in Late Antiquity: Religious Development and Myth-Making.' In *The Church and Mary*, edited by R.N. Swanson, 1–21. *Studies in Church History* 39. Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2004.
- Campanhausen, Hans von. *The Fathers of the Greek Church*. Translated by L.A. Garrard. Edinburgh: R. & R. Clark, 1963.
- . *The Formation of the Christian Bible*. Translated by J.A. Baker. London: A. and C. Black, 1972.
- Carriker, Andrew. *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea*. VCSupp 67. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Carroll, Michael P. *The Cult of the Virgin Mary: Psychological Origins*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986.
- Carrington, Philip. *The Early Christian Church*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957.
- Carson, D.A. *The Gospel According to John*. Cambridge: W.B. Eerdmans, 1991.
- Cerrato, J.A. *Hippolytus between East and West: The Commentaries and Provenance of the Corpus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Chadwick, Henry, trans. *Origen, Contra Celsum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.
- . *Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition: Studies in Justin, Clement and Origen*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966.
- . 'St. Peter and St. Paul in Rome: The Problem of the Memoria Apostolorum ad Catacumbas.' *JTS* 8, no. 1 (1957): 31–52.
- Chapman, Dom John. *John the Presbyter and the Fourth Gospel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911.
- Charlesworth, James H. *The Beloved Disciple: Whose Witness Validates the Gospel of John?* Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1995.
- Clark, Elizabeth. *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Collins, John J. 'Introduction: Towards a Morphology of Genre.' In *Semeia* 14, 1–21. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979.
- Cook, John G. *The Interpretation of the New Testament in Greco-Roman Paganism*. Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 3. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Crouzel, H, Fournier, and P. Périchon, P. (eds.). *Origène Homélie sur S. Luc, Texte Latin et Fragments Grecs de M. Rauer*. GCS, sc 87 Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1998.
- Culpepper, R. Alan. *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.
- . 'L'Application de la Narratologie à l'Étude de l'Évangile de Jean.' In *La Communauté Johannique et son Histoire: La trajectoire de l'évangile de Jean aux deux premiers siècles*, edited by Jean-Daniel Kaestli, Jean-Michel Poffet and Jean Zumstein, 97–120. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1990.
- . *John, the Son of Zebedee: The Life of a Legend*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000.



- Davis, Stephen. 'Introducing an Arabic Commentary on the Apocalypse: Ibn Kâtîb Qaysar on Revelation,' *HTR* 101 (2008): 77–96.
- De Soyers, John. *Montanism and the Primitive Church: A Study in the Ecclesiastical History of the Second Century*. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Co., 1878.
- Dechow, Jon. *Dogma and Mysticism in Early Christianity: Epiphanius of Cyprus and the Legacy of Origen*. Patristic Monograph Series 13. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988.
- Diekamp, Franz. *Doctrina Patrum de incarnatione verbi. Ein griechisches Florilegium aus der Wende des 7. und 8. Jahrhunderts*. Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1907.
- Diobouniotis, Constantin and Harnack, Adolf von. *Der Scholien-kommentar zur Apokalypse Johannis nebst einem Stück aus Irenaeus, Lib. v, Graece. TV 38,3*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1911.
- DiTommaso, Lorenzo. *The Book of Daniel and the Apocryphal Daniel Literature*. Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 20. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Döllinger, Johann Joseph Ignaz von. *Hippolytus and Callistus; or, The Church of Rome in the First Half of the Third Century*. Translated by Alfred Plummer. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1876.
- Donovan, John. *The Authorship of St. John's Gospel*. London: Burnes Oates & Washburn, 1936.
- Dulaey, Martine (ed.). *Sur l'Apocalypse: suivi du fragment chronologique et de la construction du monde*. sc. 423. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1997.
- , ed. *Victorin de Poetovio: Premier exégète Latin*. 2 Vols. Collection des Etudes Augustiniennes 139, 140. Paris: Institut d'études Augustiniennes, 1993.
- Duncker, L. and Schneidewin, F.G. eds. *S. Hippolyti Episcopi et Martyris: Refutationis Omnium Haeresium: Librorum Decem Quae Supersunt*. Göttingae: Sumptibus Dieterichianis, 1859.
- Dunn, J.D.G. 'John and the Synoptics as a Theological Question.' In *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith*, edited by R.A. Culpepper and C. Clifton Black. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996.
- Ehrman, Bart D., Fee, Gordon D., Holmes, Michael W. eds. *The Text of the Fourth Gospel in the Writings of Origen*. Vol. 1. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Evans, Ernest, trans. *Tertullian's Treatise against Praxeas*. London: SPCK, 1948.
- Exiguus, Dionysius. *A Clear and Learned Explication of the History of Our Blessed Saviour Jesus Christ: Taken Out of Above Thirty Greek, Syriack and Other Oriental Authors by Way of Catena*. Translated by Dudley Loftus. Dublin: Samuel Lee in Skinner Row, 1695.
- Ferguson, E. 'Canon Muratori Date and Provenance.' *Studia Patristica* 17/2 (1982): 677–683.



- Fisher, George P. *Some Remarks on the Alogi*. New York: Knickerbocker Press, 1892.
- Freund, W.H.C. *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church: A Study of a Conflict from the Maccabees to Donatus*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1965.
- Froidevaux, L.-M. *Irénée de Lyons: Démonstration de la Prédication Apostolique*. sc 62. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1959.
- . 'Les Questions et Réponses sur la sainte Trinité attribuées à Hippolyte, évêque de Bostra.' *Recherches de science religieuse* 50 (1962): 32–73.
- Froidevaux, L.M. *Irénée de Lyons: Démonstration de la Prédication Apostolique*. sc 62. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1959.
- Gamble, Harry Y. *The New Testament Canon*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1985.
- Garitte, Gérard. 'Une nouvelle source du « De fide » géorgien attribué à Hippolyte.' In *Revue D'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 63 (1968): 835–43.
- Goodspeed, Edgar, J. 'Recent Patristic Literature,' *AJT* 20, n. 1 (January, 1916): 115–21.
- Grant, Robert M. 'Ancient and Modern Questions about Authenticity.' In *Origins and Method: Towards a New Understanding of Judaism and Christianity. Essays in Honour of John C. Hurd*, edited by Bradley H. McLean, 295–301. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- . 'The Bible in the Ancient Church.' *JR* 26,3 (1946): 190–202.
- . *The Earliest Lives of Jesus*. London: SPCK, 1961.
- . *Eusebius as Church Historian*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980.
- . 'The Fourth Gospel and the Church.' *HTR* 35,2 (1942): 95–116.
- . *Heresy and Criticism: The Search for Authenticity in Early Christian Literature*. Louisville: Westminster/Knox, 1993.
- . 'Historical Criticism in the Ancient Church.' *JR* 25,3 (1945): 183–96.
- . *Irenaeus of Lyons*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- . 'The Origin of the Fourth Gospel.' *JBL* 69,4 (1950): 305–22.
- . *Second Century Christianity: A Collection of Fragments*. 2nd ed. London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003.
- , ed. Theophilus of Antioch, *Ad Autolycum*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.
- Guarducci, Margherita. 'La statua di 'Sant'Ippolito' in Vaticano.' In *Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia* 47 (1974–5): 163–190.
- . 'La Statua di "Sant'Ippolito".' In *Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum* 13 (1977): 17–30.
- . 'La "Statua di Sant' Ippolito" e la sua provenienza,' in *Nuove ricerche su Ippolito*, *Studia Ephemeridis Augustiniana* 30 (Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1989): 61–74.
- Gunther, J.J. 'The Alexandrian Gospel and the Letters of John.' *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 41 (1979): 581–603.
- . 'Early Identifications of Authorship of the Johannine Writings.' *JEH* 31 (1980): 407–27.

- Gwynn, John. 'Hippolytus and his "Heads against Caius".' *Hermathena*. A Series of Papers on Literature, Science and Philosophy, by Members of Trinity College, Dublin. Vol. 6 (1888): 397–418.
- . 'Hippolytus on St. Matthew 24:15–22.' *Hermathena*. A Series of Papers on Literature, Science and Philosophy, by Members of Trinity College, Dublin. Vol. 7 (1889): 137–150.
- Haenchen, Ernst. *John: A Commentary on the Gospel of John*. Translated and Edited by Robert W. Funk. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Hahneman, Geoffrey Mark. *The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.
- Hanson, R.P.C. *Allegory and Event: A Study of the Sources and Significance of Origen's Interpretation of Scripture*. London: SCM Press, 1959.
- . *Tradition in the Early Church*. London: SCM Press, 1962.
- Hargis, Jeffrey W. *Against the Christians: The Rise of Early Anti-Christian Polemic*. Patristic Studies, Vol. 1. New York: Peter Lang, 1999.
- Harnack, Adolf von. *Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*. 2 vols. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1897–1904.
- . 'Die Gwynn'schen Cajus-und Hippolytus-Fragmente.' *TU* 6, no. 3 (1890), 121–123.
- . *Porphyrius 'Gegen die Christen' 15 Bucher: Zeugnisse, Fragmente, und Referate, Abhandlungen der königlichen preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil-hist. Klasse*. Berlin, 1916.
- . *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bei Eusebius*. 2 parts in 4 vols. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1893–1904.
- . *History of Dogma*. Volume III. Translated by James Millar. London: Williams & Norgate, 1897.
- . *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott. Eine Monographie zur Geschichte der Grundlegung der katholischen Kirche. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1921. English Translation, *Marcion, the Gospel of the Alien God*. Translated by John E. Steely and Lyle D. Bierma. Durham, N.C.: Labyrinth Press, 1990.
- . *Das Neue Testament um das Jahr 200*. Freiburg: J.C.B. Mohr, 1889.
- . *Origin of the New Testament And the Most Important Consequences of the New Creation*. Translated by J.R. Wilkinson. London: Williams & Norgate, 1925.
- . *Porphyrius: 'Gegen die Christen' 15 Bucher: Zeugnisse, Fragmente, und Referate, Abhandlungen der königlichen preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil-hist. Klasse*. Berlin, 1916.
- . *Zeitschrift für historische Theologie*, II. 1874.
- Harris, J. Rendel. *The Diatessaron of Tatian: A Preliminary Study*. London: C.J. Clay and Sons, 1890.

- . 'Did Judas Really Commit Suicide?' *AJT* 4, n. 3 (Jul. 1900), 507.
- . 'Presbyter Gaius and the Fourth Gospel,' in *Hermas in Arcadia and Other Essays*, 43–59. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896.
- Head, Peter, ed. *Historical and Literary Studies in John: Challenging Current Paradigms*. *WUNT* 2. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- Heine, R.E. 'The Gospel of John and the Montanist Debate at Rome.' *Studia Patristica* 21 (1989): 95–100.
- . 'Hippolytus, Ps.-Hippolytus and the Early Canons' in *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*, 142–151. Edited by Frances Young, Lewis Ayres and Andrew Louth. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- . *The Montanist Oracles and Testimonia*. NAPS Patristic Monograph Series, 14. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1989.
- . 'The Role of the Gospel of John in the Montanist Controversy.' *Second Century* vol. 6 (1987): 1–18.
- Hengel, Martin. *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Collection and Origin of the Canonical Gospels*. Translated by John Bowden. London: SCM Press, 2000.
- . *The Johannine Question*. London: SCM Press, 1989.
- Hill, Charles E. 'Cerinthus, Gnostic or Chiliast? A New Solution to an Old Problem.' *J ECS* 8 (2000): 135–172.
- . 'The Debate Over the Muratorian Fragment and the Date of the Canon.' *Westminster Theological Journal* 57:2 (Fall 1995): 437–452.
- . 'The Fragments of Papias.' In *The Writings of the Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Paul Foster, 42–51. New York: T&T Press, 2007.
- . *From the Lost Teaching of Polycarp: Identifying Irenaeus' Apostolic Presbyter and the Author of Ad Diognetum*. *WUNT* 186. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- . 'Hades of Hippolytus or Tartarus of Tertullian? The Authorship of the Fragment de Universo.' *VC* 43, no. 2 (June 1989): 105–26.
- . *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- . 'The Marriage of Montanism and Millennialism.' In *Studia Patristica* 26 (1993): 140–46.
- . '“The Orthodox Gospel”: The Reception of John in the Great Church Prior to Irenaeus.' In *The Legacy of John: Second-Century Reception of the Fourth Gospel*, edited by Tuomas Rasimus, 233–300. *NovTSupp* 132. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- . *Regnum Caelorum: Patterns of Millennial Thought in Early Christianity*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- . 'Was John's Gospel Among Justin's Apostolic Memoirs?' in *Justin Martyr and His Worlds*, edited by Sara Parvis and Paul Foster, 88–93. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.

- . 'What Papias Said About John (And Luke): A "New" Papian Fragment.' *JTS* 49 (1998), 582–629.
- . *Who Chose the Gospels? Probing the Great Gospel Conspiracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Hillmer, Melvyn Raymond. 'The Gospel of John in the Second Century.' ThD diss., Harvard University, 1966.
- Hitchcock, F.R. Montgomery. *Irenaeus of Lugdunum: A Study of His Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914.
- Holl, Karl and Dummer, Jürgen. *Epiphanius I. Ancoratus und Panarion haer.* 1–33. *GCS* 25, Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1915.
- . *Epiphanius II. Panarion haer.* 34–64. *GCS* 31,2, Bearbeitete Auflage. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1980.
- Holmes, Michael W. *The Apostolic Fathers*. 3rd Edition. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006.
- . 'The Biblical Canon.' In *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*, edited by Susan A. Harvey and David G. Hunter, 406–426. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- . 'Origen and the Inerrancy of Scripture.' *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 24/3 (1981): 221–31.
- Hort, Fenton John Anthony. *Judaistic Christianity: A Course of Lectures*. Cambridge: Macmillan and Co., 1894.
- Hulen, Amos Berry. *Porphyry's Work Against the Christians: An Interpretation*. Yale Studies in Religion, 1. Scottdale, PA: Mennonite Press, 1933.
- Hurtado, Larry. *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Jacobs, Andrew. 'Epiphanius of Salamis and the Antiquarian's Bible.' *J ECS* 21 (2013): 437–64.
- Jeffers, James S. *Conflict at Rome: Social Order and Hierarchy in Early Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.
- Kaestli, J.-D., Poffet, J.-M., and Zumstein, J., eds. *La Communauté johannique et son histoire: La Trajectoire de l'évangile de Jean aux deux premiers siècles*. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1990.
- Keefer, Kyle. *The Branches of the Gospel of John: The Reception of the Fourth Gospel in the Early Church*. New York: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Keener, Craig. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. 2 vols. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003.
- Kellum, L. Scott. *The Unity of the Farewell Discourse: The Literary Integrity of John 13:31–16:33*. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Kelly, Joseph F.T. 'Early Medieval Evidence for Twelve Homilies by Origen on the Apocalypse,' *VC* 39,3 (1985): 273–9.

- Kim, Young Richard. 'The Imagined Worlds of Epiphanius of Cyprus.' PhD diss., University of Michigan, 2006.
- . 'Reading the Panarion as Collective Biography: The Heresiarch as Unholy Man.' *VC* 64.4 (2010): 382–413.
- Klawiter, Frederick C. 'The New Prophecy in Early Christianity; the Origin, Nature, and Development of Montanism, AD 165–220.' PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1975.
- Klijn, A.F.J., and Reinink, G.J. *Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian Sects. NovTSupp* 36. Leiden: Brill, 1973.
- Klostermann, E. ed. *Origenes Werke. GCS* 12,3 Band, III, 1. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs Verlag, 1941.
- Knox, John. *Marcion and the New Testament: An Essay in the Early History of the Canon*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942.
- Koester, Helmut. *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development*. London: SCM Press, 1990.
- . *Introduction to the New Testament*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982.
- . 'The Story of the Johannine Tradition.' *Sewanee Theological Review*, 36 (1992): 17–32.
- . 'Writings and the Spirit: Authority and Politics in Ancient Christianity.' *HTR* 84, no. 4 (October 1991): 353–372.
- Kraemer, Ross Shepard. 'Women and Gender.' In *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*, edited by Susan A. Harvey and David G. Hunter, 465–492. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Kümmel, Werner Georg. *The New Testament: The History of the Investigation of Its Problems*. Translated by S. Gilmour and H. Kee. London: SCM Press, 1973.
- Kunze, J. *De Historiae Gnosticis Fontibus: novae quaestiones criticae*. Leipzig, 1894.
- Kürzinger, Josef. *Papias von Hierapolis und die Evangelien des Neuen Testaments*. Regensburg: Verlag FriedrichPustet, 1983.
- Labourt, J. *Saint Jérôme, Lettres, tomes I–VIII*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1949–1963.
- Labriolle, Pierre de. *La Crise Montaniste*. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1913.
- . *History and Literature of Christianity from Tertullian to Boethius*. Translated by Herbert Wilson. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1968.
- . *La réaction païenne: étude sur la polémique antichrétienne du I<sup>er</sup> au VI<sup>e</sup> siècle*. Paris: l'Artisan du livre, 1934.
- . *Les Sources De L'Histoire Du Montanisme*. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1913.
- Ladeuze, Pierre. 'Caius de Rome, le seul Alogé connu.' In *Mélanges Godefroid Kurth*, 49–60. Vol. 2. Liège: Sonderabdruck, 1908.
- Laeuchli, Samuel. 'The Polarity of the Gospels in the Exegesis of Origen.' *Church History* 21 (1952): 215–24.
- Lagarde, Paul. *Hippolyti Romani Quae Feruntur Omnia Graece*. Leipzig: B.G. Teubneri, 1858.

- Lagrange, M.-J. *Évangile Selon Saint Jean*. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1927.
- . 'L'Auteur du canon de Muratori.' *Rbib* 35 (1926): 83–88.
- Lampe, Peter. 'Early Christians in the City of Rome. Topographical and Social Historical Aspects of the First Three Centuries.' In *Christians as a Religious Minority in a Multicultural City: Modes of Interaction and Identity Formation in Early Imperial Rome*, edited by Jürgen Zangenberg and Michael Labahn, 20–32. *JSNTS* 243. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- . *From Paul to Valentinus: Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries*. Translated by Michael Steinhauser. Edited by Marshall D. Johnson. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.
- Lawlor, Hugh Jackson. *Evsebiana: Essays on the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius Bishop of Caesarea*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912.
- . 'Eusebius on Papias.' *Hermathena* 19 (1922): 167–222.
- Lawson, John. *The Biblical Theology of Saint Irenaeus*. London: Epworth Press, 1948.
- Layton, Bentley. *The Gnostic Scriptures*. New York: Doubleday & Company, 1987.
- Le Boulluec, Alain. *La notion d'hérésie dans la littérature grecque 11<sup>e</sup>–111<sup>e</sup> siècles*. 2 Vols. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1985.
- Le Joly, Raymond, ed. *Dionysii bar Salibi Enarratio in Ioannem*. 4 Vols. Dison: Éditions Concile, 1975.
- Leipoldt, Johannes. *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1907.
- LeMarié, Joseph. 'Saint Chromace d'Aquilée témoin du Canon de Muratori.' *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* no. 24, 1–2 (1978): 101–2.
- Lewis, Frank Grant. *The Irenaeus Testimony to the Fourth Gospel: Its Extent, Meaning and Value*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1908.
- Lienhard, J.T. (trans.). *Origen: Homilies on Luke*. Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1996.
- Lightfoot, J.B. *The Apostolic Fathers. Part 1: S. Clement of Rome*. Vol. 2. London: Macmillan and Co., 1890.
- . *Biblical Essays*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1893.
- . 'Caius or Hippolytus?' *Journal of Philology* 1, 1 (1868): 98–112.
- . *Essays on the Work entitled Supernatural Religion*. London: Macmillan, 1889.
- . 'Internal Evidence for the Authenticity and Genuineness of Saint John's Gospel': 131–171. In *The Fourth Gospel and Its Authorship*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1892.
- Lightfoot, J.B. and Harmer, J.R., eds. *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. Revised by Michael W. Holmes. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998.
- Lipsius, Robert A. *Die Quellen der ältesten Ketzergeschichte*. Leipzig, 1875.
- . *Zur Quellenkritik des Epiphanios*. Vienna: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1865.

- Logan, Alastair H.B. *The Gnostics: Identifying an Early Christian Cult*. London: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Loi, Vincenzo et al., *Ricerche su Ippolito* *Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum* 13. Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1977.
- Louth, Andrew. 'Palestine: Cyril of Jerusalem and Epiphanius' in *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*. Edited by Frances Young, Lewis Ayres and Andrew Louth, 283–88. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Lyman, J. Rebecca. 'The Making of a Heretic: The Life of Origen in Epiphanius *Panarion* 64.' *Studia Patristica* 31 (1997): 445–51.
- Mai, Angelo, ed. *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio e Vaticanis codicibus*. 10 Vols. Rome: Typis Vaticanis, 1825–1838.
- Manor, T. Scott. 'Epiphanius' Account of the *Alogi*: Historical Fact or Heretical Fiction?' *Studia Patristica* 52 (2012), 161–70.
- . 'Papias, Origen, and Eusebius: The Criticisms and Defense of the Gospel of John.' *Vigilae Christianae* 67.1 (2013), 1–21.
- . 'Proclus: The North African Montanist?' *Studia Patristica* 65 (2013), 139–146.
- Marcovich, M. *Hippolytus. Refutatio omnium haeresium*. (PTS 25), Berlin-New York, 1986.
- . *Iustini Martyris. Dialogue cum Tryphone*. (PTS 47) Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997.
- Markschies, Christoph. *Between Two Worlds: Structures of Earliest Christianity*. Translated by John Bowden. London: SCM Press, 1999.
- Marx, F. ed. *Sancti Filastrii Episcopi Brixienensis: Diversarum Hereseon Liber*. CSEL 38. Vindobonae: F. Tempsky, 1898.
- Martens, Peter. *Origen and Scripture: The Contours of the Exegetical Life*. *Early Christian Studies Series*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- McCarthy, Carmel, ed. *Saint Ephrem's Commentary on Tatian's Diatessaron: An English Translation of Chester Beatty Syriac Ms 709 with Introduction and Notes*. *Journal of Semitic Studies Supplement* 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- McDonald, Lee M. 'The Gospels in Early Christianity: Their Origin, Use, and Authority.' In *Reading the Gospels Today*, edited by Stanley E. Porter, 150–78. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Merkel, Helmut. *Die Plurität der Evangelien: als theologisches und exegetisches Problem in der Alten Kirche*. *Traditio Christiana* 111. Bern: Peter Lang, 1978.
- . *Die Widersprüche zwischen den Evangelien; Ihre polemische und apologetische Behandlung in der alten Kirche bis zu Augustin*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1971.
- Metzger, Bruce. *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development and Significance*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.
- . *Historical and Literary Studies: Pagan, Jewish and Christian*, *New Testament Tools and Studies*, vol. 8. Leiden: Brill, 1968.



- Metzger, Bruce M. and Ehrman, Bart D. *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption and Restoration*. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Mingana, A., ed., trans. *Christian Documents in Syriac, Arabic, and Garshuni*. 4 vols. Woodbrooke Studies. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons Ltd., 1927.
- Minns, Denis. *Irenaeus*. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1994.
- Moffatt, James. *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*. 3rd ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1927.
- Moll, Sebastian. *The Arch-Heretic Marcion*. WUNT 250. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- . 'Three Against Tertullian: The Second Tradition About Marcion's Life.' *JTS* 59 (2008): 169–80.
- Murator, Ludovico Antonio. *Antiquitates italicæ medi ævi*, Tom. III. Mediolani: ex typographia Societatis palatinae, 1738–1742.
- Nagel, Titus. *Die Rezeption des Johannesevangeliums im 2. Jahrhundert: Studien zur vorirenäischen Auslegung des vierten Evangeliums in christlich-gnostischer Literatur*. Arbeiten Zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte, 2. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsantalt, 2000.
- Nasrallah, Laura Salah. 'An Ecstasy of Folly': *Prophecy and Authority in Early Christianity*. Harvard Theological Studies 52. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Nautin, Pierre. *Le dossier d'Hippolyte et de Méliton dans les florilèges dogmatiques et chez les historiens modernes*. Patristica 1. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1953.
- . *Hippolyte et Josipe: Contribution à l'histoire de la Littérature Chrétienne du troisième siècle*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1947.
- . *Hippolyte, Contre les heresies: fragment, étude, et édition critique*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1949.
- . 'Hippolytus' in *The Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, vol. 1, 383–85. Edited by Angelo Di Berardino. Translated by Adrian Walford. Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 1992.
- Norelli, Enrico. 'Papias de Hiérapolis a-t-il utilisé un recueil 'canonique' des quatre évangiles?' In G. Aragione, E. Junod and E. Norelli (eds.) *Le canon du Nouveau Testament: Regards nouveaux sur l'histoire de sa formation*. Le mond de la Bible 54. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 2005: 35–85.
- O'Keefe, John J. '“A Letter that Killeth”: Toward a Reassessment of Antiochene Exegesis, or Diodore, Theodore, and Theodoret on the Psalms.' *J ECS* 8.1 (2000): 83–103.
- Osborn, Eric. *Irenaeus of Lyons*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Pagels, Elaine. *Beyond Belief: The Secret Gospel of Thomas*. New York: Random House, 2003.
- Perrin, Nicholas. 'The Diatessaron and the Second-Century Reception of the Gospel of John.' In *The Legacy of John: Second-Century Reception of the Fourth Gospel*, edited by Tuomas Rasimus, 301–18. *NovTSupp* 132. Leiden: Brill, 2010.



- Petersen, William L., ed. *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text and Transmission*. South Bend, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989.
- . 'Tatian's Diatessaron,' in *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development*, ed. H. Koester, 403–30. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity International Press, 1990.
- . *Tatian's Diatessaron: Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance, and History in Scholarship*. VCSupp xxv. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Phillips, George, ed. *The Doctrine of Addai, the Apostle*. London: Trübner and Company, 1876.
- Phipps, Charles B. 'Persecution under Marcus Aurelius: An Historical Hypothesis.' *Hermathena* 47 (1932): 167–201.
- Piana, G. 'The Roman Church at the End of the Second Century. The Episcopate of Victor, the Latinization of the Roman Church, the Easter Controversy, Consolidation of Power and Doctrinal Development, the Catacomb of Callistus.' *HTR* 18,3 (1925): 201–77.
- Poffett, Jean-Michel. 'Indices de Réception de l'Évangile de Jean au II<sup>e</sup> Siècle, avant Irénée.' In *La Communauté Johannique et son Histoire: La trajectoire de l'évangile de Jean aux deux premiers siècles*, edited by Jean-Daniel Kaestli, Jean-Michel Poffett and Jean Zumstein, 305–21. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1990.
- Pollard, T.E. *Johannine Christology and the Early Church*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- . 'John the Evangelist, Gospel of,' *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*. Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 1992. Vol. 1, 448–9.
- Pourkier, Aline. 'Épiphane Témoin du Texte d'Irénée: Note Critique sur Irénée, Adv. Haer. I, 24, 6.' *VC* 38 (1924): 281–284.
- . *L'Hérésologie chez Épiphane de Salamine*. Christianisme Antique 4. Paris: Beauchesne Editeur, 1992.
- Powell, Douglas. 'Tertullianists and Cataphrygians.' *VC* 29 (1975): 33–54.
- Prigent, Pierre. *Commentary on the Apocalypse of St. John*. Translated by Wendy Pradels. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- . 'Hippolyte, Commentateur de l'Apocalypse.' *TZ* 28 (1972): 391–412.
- . 'Les Fragments du De Apocalypse d'Hippolyte.' *TZ* 29 (1973): 313–33.
- Prigent, Pierre and Stehly, R. 'Citations d'Hippolyte trouvée dans le ms. Bodl. Syr 140.' *TZ* 30 (1974): 82–85.
- Prinzivalli, E. 'Hippolytus, Statue of,' in *The Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, vol. 1, 385. Edited by Angelo Di Berardino. Translated by Adrian Walford. Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 1992.
- Quispel, G. *Ptolémée, Lettre à Flora. Texte, traduction et introduction*. SC 24. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1949.

- Ramsay, W.M. *The Church in The Roman Empire Before AD 170*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1893.
- Rasmus, Tuomas, Ed., *The Legacy of John: Second-Century Reception of the Fourth Gospel*. *NovTSupp* 132. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Roberts, A. and Donaldson, J. Editors. *Ante-Nice Christian Library: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to AD 325*. 5 Vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1868.
- Robinson, J.A.T. 'Origen's Comments on the Apocalypse.' *JTS* 13 (1911): 295–7.
- Robinson, Theodore H. 'The Authorship of the Muratorian Canon.' *The Expositor*, 7, 1 (1906): 481–95.
- Röhl, Wolfgang G. *Die Rezeption des Johannesevangeliums in christlich-gnostischen Schriften aus Nag Hammadi*, Europäische Hochschulschriften, Publications Universitaires Européennes, 23, Theologie, 428. Frankfurt am Main, 1991.
- Rokéah, David. *Justin Martyr and the Jews*. Jewish and Christian Perspectives Series, Vol. v. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Rose, V. 'Question Johannine: Les Aloges Asiatiques et les Aloges Romains.' *Rbib* 6 (1897): 516–34.
- Rousseau, A. *Irénée de Lyon. Démonstration de la prédication apostolique*; introduction, traduction et notes. SC 406. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1995.
- Rousseau, A. and Doutreleau, L. *Irénée de Lyon. Contre les hérésies*. Édition critique d'après les versions arménienne et latine. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1965.
- Routh, Martinus Josephus. *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, Vol. 11 Oxonii: Typis Academicis, 1814.
- Salmon, G. 'The Commentary of Hippolytus on Daniel.' *Hermathena* 8 (1892): 161–190.
- Sanday, William. *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel: Eight Lectures on the Morse Foundation, Delivered in the Union Seminary, New York in October and November, 1904*. New York: Scribner's, 1905.
- Sanders, J.N. *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John*. Edited by B.A. Mastin. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1969.
- . *The Foundations of the Christian Faith: A Study of the Teaching of the New Testament in Light of Historical Criticism*. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1951.
- . *The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1943.
- Schlimme, Lorenz. 'Did Bibelkommtare des Moses Bar Kepha.' In *A Tribute to Arthur Vööbus, Studies in Early Christian Literature and Its Environment, Primarily in the Syrian East*, edited by Robert H. Fischer, 63–72. Chicago: The Lutheran School of Theology, 1977.
- Schmidt, Carl. 'Exkurs 1: Der Gnostiker Kerinth. Die Aloger.' In *Gespräche Jesu Mit Seinen Jüngern Nach Der Auferstehung: Ein Katholisch-Apostolisches Sendschreiben Des 2. Jahrhunderts*. Leipzig: J.D. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1919.
- Schmoldt, H. 'Die Schrift 'Vom jungen Daniel' und 'Daniels letzte Vision.' herausgabe und Interpretation zweier apokalyptischer Texte.' Ph.D. Dissertation: Hamburg, 1972.

- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *The Gospel According to St. John*. 3 vols. Translated by Kevin Smyth. London: Burns & Oates, 1968.
- Schwartz, Eduard. 'Johannes und Kerinthos.' *ZNW* 15 (1914): 210–19.
- . 'Noch einmal der Tod der Söhne Zebedaei.' *ZNW* 11 (1910): 89–104.
- . 'Über den Tod der Söhne Zebedaei.' In *Gesammelte Schriften* 5, 48–123. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter & Co., 1963. Originally published in *Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Johannesevangeliums: Abhandlungen d. Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wiss. N.F.* VII, 5 (1904): 3–53.
- Schwartz, E. and Mommsen, T. *Eusebius Werke* 11, 1. *Die Kirchengeschichte* (GCS 9,1). Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1903.
- . *Eusebius Werke* 11, 2. *Die Kirchengeschichte* (GCS Neue Folge—Band 6, 2). Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1999.
- Sedláček, I. *Dionysius Bar Salibî. In Apocalypsim, Actus et Epistulas catholicas*. CSCO 60. Scriptores Syri. Louvain: Imprimerie Orientaliste L. Durbecq, 1954.
- Sedláček, I and Chabot, I.-B. *Dionysii bar Salibi, commentarii in evangelia* I. CSCO 85. Scriptores Syri. Louvain: Imprimerie Orientaliste L. Durbecq, 1922.
- Seim, Turid Karlsen. 'Johannine Echoes in Early Montanism.' In *The Legacy of John: Second-Century Reception of the Fourth Gospel*, edited by Tuomas Rasimus, 345–64. *NovTSupp*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Sellew, P. 'Eusebius and the Gospels.' In *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism*, edited by H.W. Attridge and G. Hata, 110–38. *Studia Post-Biblica* 42. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Skarsaune, Oskar. *In the Shadow of the Temple: Jewish Influences on Early Christianity*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2002.
- . *The Proof from Prophecy, A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition: Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile*. Supplements to *Novum Testamentum* Vol. LV1. Leiden: Brill, 1987.
- Skeat, T.C. 'Irenaeus and the Four-Gospel Canon.' *NovT* 34, 2 (1992): 194–99.
- . 'The Oldest Manuscript of the Four Gospels.' *New Testament Studies* 43 (1997): 1–34.
- Smith, D. Moody. 'The Problem of John and the Synoptics in Light of the Relation between Apocryphal and Canonical Gospels.' In *John and the Synoptics*, edited by A. Denaux, 147–162. *Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium* 101. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.
- Smith, J.P. *St. Irenaeus: Proof of the Apostolic Preaching*. Ancient Christian Writers 16. Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1952.
- Smith Jr., Joseph Daniel. 'Gaius and the Controversy over the Johannine Literature.' PhD diss., Yale University, 1979.
- Stanton, Graham N. 'The Fourfold Gospel.' *New Testament Studies* 43, 3 (1997): 317–46.
- . *Jesus and Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

- . 'The Spirit in the Writings of Justin Martyr.' In *The Holy Spirit and Christian Origins: Essays in Honor of James D.G. Dunn*, edited by Graham N. Stanton, Bruce W. Longenecker and Stephen C. Barton, 321–34. Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Stanton, Vincent Henry. *The Gospels as Historical Documents*. 3 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1903.
- Stevenson, J., ed. *A New Eusebius: Documents illustrating the history of the Church to AD 337*. Revised by W.H.C. Frend. London: SPCK, 1987.
- Stonehouse, Ned B. *The Apocalypse in the Ancient Church: A Study in the History of the New Testament Canon*. Goes, Holland: Oosterbaan & Le Cointre, 1929.
- Streeter, B.H. *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins*. London: Macmillan & Co., 1927.
- Sundberg, Jr., A.C. 'Canon Muratori: A Fourth-Century List.' *HTR* 66 (1973): 1–41.
- Tabbernee, William. *Fake Prophecy and Polluted Sacraments: Ecclesiastical and Imperial Reactions to Montanism*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- . *Montanist Inscriptions and Testimonia: Epigraphic Sources Illustrating the History of Montanism*. Patristic Monograph Series 16. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1997.
- . 'The Opposition to Montanism from Church and State.' PhD diss., University of Melbourne, 1978.
- . 'Portals of the Montanist New Jerusalem: The Discovery of Pepouza and Tymion.' *JES* 11 (2003): 87–93.
- . *Prophets and Gravestones: An Imaginative History of Montanists and Other Early Christians*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2009.
- . 'Remnants of the New Prophecy: Literary and Epigraphical Sources of the Montanist Movement.' *Studia Patristica* 21 (1989), 193–198.
- Trevett, Christine. *Montanism: Gender, Authority and the New Prophecy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Turner, C.H. 'Origen Scholia in Apocalypsin.' *JTS* 25 (1924): 1–16.
- . 'The Text of the Newly Discovered Scholia of Origen on the Apocalypse.' *JTS* 13 (1912): 386–97.
- Turner, H.E.W. *The Pattern of Christian Truth: A Study in the Relations between Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Early Church*. London: Mowbray & Co., 1954.
- Vallée, Gérard. *A Study in Anti-Gnostic Polemics: Irenaeus, Hippolytus, and Epiphanius*. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1981.
- Vaschalde, A. *Dionysii bar Salibi, commentarii in evangelia* 11. CSCO 60. Scriptores Syri. Louvain: Imprimerie Orientaliste L. Durbecq, 1939.
- Vinzent, Markus. "'Philobiblie' im frühen Christentum." *Das Altertum* 44, 4 (1999): 301–30.
- . 'Hippolyt von Rom und seine Statue.' *zur Zeit oder Unzeit. Studien zur spätantiken Theologie-, Geistes- und Kunstgeschichte und ihrer Nachwirkung*. Hans Georg

- Thümmel zu Ehren, Edited by A.M. Ritter, W. Wischmeyer, and W. Kinzig, 125–34. *Texts and Studies in the History of Theology*, 9. Cambridge: Edition Cicero, 2004.
- Vokes, F.E. 'The Use of Scripture in the Montanist Controversy.' *Studia Evangelica* 5 (1968): 317–20.
- Wallace-Hadrill, D.S. *Eusebius of Caesarea*. London: A.R. Mowbray, 1960.
- Weinrich, William C., ed. *Revelation: Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture, New Testament XII*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2005.
- Westcott, Brooke Foss. *A General Survey of the Canon of the New Testament*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1875.
- Williams, F., trans. *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*. Book I (Sects 1–46. Nag Hammadi and Manichean Studies, vol. xxxv. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- , trans. *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*. Books II and III (Sects 47–80, *De Fide*). Nag Hammadi and Manichean Studies, vol. xxxvi. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Wingren, Gustaf. *Man and the Incarnation: A Study in the Biblical Theology of Irenaeus*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1959.
- Wright, W. *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum Acquired Since the Year 1838*. 3 Vols. London, 1870.
- Young, Frances M. 'Did Epiphanius know what he meant by Heresy?' *Studia Patristica* 17 (1983): 199–205.
- Zahn, Theodor. *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen und der altkirchlichen Literature*. Vol. 6. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1900.
- . *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*. 2 vols. Erlangen: Verlag von Andreas Deichert, 1888–1890.
- Zamagni, Claudio, ed. *Eusèbe de Césarée, Questions Évangéliques, Introduction, Texte Critique, Traduction et Notes*. sc 523. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2008.
- Zumstein, Jean. 'La Communauté Johannique et son Histoire.' In *La Communauté Johannique et son Histoire: La trajectoire de l'évangile de Jean aux deux premiers siècles*, edited by Jean-Daniel Kaestli, Jean-Michel Poffet and Jean Zumstein, 359–374. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1990.

# Index of Modern Authors

- Barnes 63 n. 41, 152 n. 19, 153, 155 n. 25, 170 nn. 22–23, 198 n. 50
- Bauckham 4 n. 7, 163 n. 1, 165, 167 n. 15, 191 n. 28, 202 n. 6, 203 n. 9, 204–205, 207–208, 209, 210–211, 218 n. 57
- Brent 18 n. 9, 45–48, 50, 57 n. 18, 59, 71 n. 70, 72 n. 80, 74, 77, 78 n. 102, 79 n. 107, 80 n. 111, 82 n. 118, 84 n. 2, 86 n. 7, 88 n. 17, 89–93, 94 n. 46, 96 n. 56, 99 n. 62, 102 n. 71, 105–106, 107 n. 80, 108 n. 82, 110, 111, 113–116, 118 n. 107, 133 n. 26, 138 n. 48, 139–140, 151, 170 n. 25, 171
- Cerrato 94 n. 45, 105 n. 74, 133 n. 26, 170 n. 22
- Chadwick 151 n. 12–13, 152
- Clark 182 n. 11, 197 n. 45
- Culpepper 3 n. 6, 40 n. 39, 44 n. 62–65, 45 n. 66, 52 n. 2, 54 n. 10, 62 n. 39, 64 n. 46, 69 n. 66, 130 n. 22, 145 n. 5, 165, 169 n. 20
- Dechow 125, 182 n. 12, 195, 196 n. 43
- Ehrman 197, 198 nn. 48–49
- Grant 3 n. 5, 6 n. 9, 7 n. 15, 38–39, 41 n. 43, 44 n. 62, 45, 49 n. 82, 61 n. 32, 66 n. 49, 67, 77, 79 n. 108, 130, 136, 152 n. 17, 191 n. 28, 223 n. 14
- Hahneman 44 n. 64, 45 n. 67, 52 n. 6, 56 n. 16, 157
- Head 4 n. 7
- Heine 44 n. 63, 69–72, 133 n. 26, 138 n. 50, 169 n. 20
- Hengel 4 n. 7, 44 nn. 63–65, 45 n. 67, 53 n. 6, 82 n. 120, 151 n. 12, 152 nn. 17–18, 156 n. 30, 158, 165, 167 n. 13–14, 171 n. 26, 203 n. 9, 211 n. 39
- Hill ix, 3, 4 n. 7, 45 n. 67, 47–48, 50, 53 n. 6, 59, 79, 80 n. 110, 81 n. 117, 110, 139 n. 57, 142, 152 n. 17, 156 n. 30, 159 n. 38, 164–166, 167 n. 15, 169 n. 19, 173, 175, 187, 190, 197 n. 46, 200, 201 n. 3, 202 nn. 4, 6, 203–210, 213 n. 43, 218, 225, 228
- Holmes 113 n. 95, 163 n. 1, 180 n. 5, 181 n. 9, 197, 198 n. 48, 221 n. 4
- Jacobs ix, 183 n. 14
- Keefter 4 n. 7
- Kim ix, 8 n. 17, 125, 127–128, 145 n. 4, 175 n. 38, 182 n. 13
- Koester 156 n. 30
- Lyman 128 n. 13
- Marcovich 59 n. 28, 133 n. 26, 141, 193
- Martens 180 nn. 5, 7, 181
- Merkel 150 n. 7, 151 nn. 12–13, 152, 155 n. 24, 159 nn. 40–41, 167, 184 n. 15
- Metzger 44 n. 63, 159 n. 38, 198 n. 48
- Moll 133 n. 28, 158 n. 38
- O'Keefe 183 n. 14
- Pagels 53 n. 7, 157, 158 n. 37
- Perrin 152 n. 17, 155 n. 27, 156 n. 30, 191 n. 28
- Petersen 129 n. 19, 152 n. 17, 156 nn. 30–31, 157 nn. 33–34
- Skarsaune 78, 79 n. 109, 80 n. 110, 81 n. 117
- Stanton 6, 41 nn. 41–46, 45 n. 67, 52 n. 6, 82 nn. 118–120, 152 n. 17, 156 n. 30, 158, 159 n. 40, 165, 167 n. 13, 203 n. 9
- Tabbernee 60 n. 31, 72, 73 nn. 86–87, 136, 137 n. 44
- Trevett 69 n. 64, 71–72
- Vinzent 138 n. 50
- Williams 11 n. 18, 44 n. 62, 49 n. 82, 126 n. 7, 127, 128 n. 13, 145 n. 4, 175 n. 35
- Young 128 nn. 13–14, 129 n. 16, 133 n. 26, 183 n. 14
- Zamagni 215 nn. 50–51, 216, 217 nn. 53–54

# Subject Index

- Aenon 20, 185, 187–188, 202, 213  
Aeons 47, 146, 154, 173–175, 208 n. 25  
Alexandria 183 n. 14  
allegorical exegesis 19, 179–183  
Antichrist 22, 110, 112–113, 119, 144  
Antioch 183 n. 14, 193  
Apocalypse (of John) 3, 5, 7, 10, 15, 20–22, 24–26, 28–30, 33–44, 46–48, 49 n. 82, 54, 56–58, 60–61, 67, 68 n. 60, 74–82, 84, 86 n. 6, 89, 99 n. 62, 102 n. 71, 103–109, 113, 115–118, 123–124, 133, 135, 137, 139–144, 146, 151, 155, 160, 178, 220–229, 231–232  
Apollinaris 112–113, 132, 153  
Arsinoë 80  
Asia Minor 6, 40, 69, 71–72, 174, 208  
  
baptism 23, 29, 32, 149, 172–173, 187–188, 194, 197 n. 46, 207–208  
Barbarism 124  
Basilides 38, 180  
Blastus 134  
  
Cana 23, 29, 32, 146, 186, 194, 198, 206, 208, 211  
canon 1, 40, 43, 52–53, 64, 67, 74, 143, 148–149, 155, 157, 158 n. 38, 159 n. 38, 163 n. 1, 166, 172, 230  
Celsus 46 n. 75, 145, 149–154, 160, 180–181, 187 n. 20, 192, 207, 214–217, 230  
Cerinthus 3, 5, 7, 15, 18, 21–22, 28–31, 36, 38–40, 42, 43 n. 57, 57–58, 60, 66–67, 75–81, 82 n. 120, 107–109, 111–112, 114–118, 128, 135, 144–145, 148–150, 160, 172–173, 187 n. 20, 196, 219, 222–224, 226–231  
chiliastic 3, 80, 110, 115, 164, 223, 225  
christology 39, 45 n. 67, 66, 111, 112, 149, 196–197  
Clement of Alexandria 66 n. 52, 157, 163, 173 n. 33, 178, 202, 204, 210, 218 n. 56  
  
*Dialogue with Proclus* 18–19, 28, 34–37, 39, 41–42, 43 n. 55, 44, 49 n. 83, 55–58, 61–62, 64 n. 46, 66–70, 75, 98–99, 117, 231  
*Diatessaron* 155, 156 n. 29, 157, 191–192  
  
Dionysius bar Salibi 7–8, 26, 28–37, 40, 44–50, 54–59, 61, 64, 67 n. 56, 68 n. 60, 69–70, 73–74, 76, 78–79, 82–93, 97–119, 132–133, 135 n. 35, 136–137, 139, 194–195, 231–232  
Dionysius of Alexandria 3, 6, 10, 20–21, 39–40, 42, 60, 66 n. 54, 75–79, 81, 104–105, 107–109, 111–112, 114–115, 140, 142, 220, 223–227, 229, 230–231  
disciples 23, 111, 164–165, 181, 186, 189, 201, 203 n. 9, 207, 213, 218 n. 56  
  
Ebed-Jesu 7–8, 18, 28, 32–33, 40, 46–47, 55–56, 58, 74, 76, 84–85, 87, 91–97, 102, 119, 132–133, 137 n. 46, 138–140, 222, 231  
Ebionites 112, 148–150, 157, 160, 172–173, 195–196, 230  
Egypt 23, 80, 88 n. 19, 150, 214–216, 219  
Elder John 31, 104, 163–164  
elders 66, 164, 208 n. 25  
Ephesus 104, 167, 179 n. 4  
Epistles of John 3, 22, 25–26, 104, 144, 168–169, 221  
Eusebius 3, 6, 10, 15, 18–19, 21, 26, 28, 30, 34–37, 39–42, 47, 49 n. 82–83, 55–68, 73, 75–77, 79–81, 97 n. 58, 99 n. 62, 103–112, 114–115, 117, 131–132, 140, 153, 155, 157, 163–166, 170, 177–179, 181, 191–193, 199–200, 201–219, 223–228, 230–231  
  
flesh 19, 22–23, 75, 77, 111, 144, 150, 186, 202, 214  
four-fold Gospel 40, 52, 53 n. 7, 64, 143, 147–149, 155, 156 n. 30, 157–158, 160, 166, 172, 208, 230  
  
Gaius 6 n. 11, 7–8, 10, 15, 16 n. 3, 17 n. 5, 18–19, 26–47, 48 n. 81, 49 nn. 82–83, 50, 52–71, 72 nn. 76–77, 73–82, 84–94, 97–102, 104–110, 113–119, 130 n. 22, 132–133, 137 nn. 45–46, 140, 141 n. 62, 169 nn. 19–20, 170, 186, 173 n. 32, 177, 186, 191–196, 198 n. 51, 202, 213 n. 40, 215 n. 47, 230–231  
gnostic(s), gnosticism 2, 6, 38–39, 45 n. 67, 54, 74, 123, 134 n. 32, 147, 154, 156 n. 30, 158, 173–175

- Gospel of John 2 n. 4, 3–4, 6, 16, 19, 21–22, 24, 28–30, 33, 35–39, 41–44, 45 n. 67, 47, 50 n. 84, 54, 64, 66–70, 72 n. 81, 73–74, 98, 107, 116, 135, 140 n. 60, 143–146, 148, 152, 154–155, 156 n. 30, 165–174, 176–180, 186, 191–194, 197–198, 200, 203–205, 211, 213, 217, 219–220, 223–224, 229–232
- Gospel of Truth* 157, 167
- harmonization 156
- Hegesippus 202, 203 n. 7
- Hellenism 124
- Heracleon 38, 192, 197
- heresy 1–2, 5, 7–8, 10–11, 15–16, 21, 24, 37, 46, 52–53, 73 n. 86, 82, 123–125, 127 n. 11, 128–129, 131, 135, 142–143, 144 n. 4, 146–147, 160, 174, 176, 181–182, 197, 221, 228, 230, 232
- heterodox 82, 115, 147
- Hippolytus 5–6, 15, 17, 18 n. 11, 26, 28–37, 39, 42–43, 45–46, 50, 54, 56–61, 63, 65, 69–70, 72–79, 81 n. 116, 82, 85–94, 129–134, 136–142, 169 n. 19, 172–173, 175, 192–193, 195, 203, 222–224, 230–231
- Holy Spirit 17, 22–23, 25, 144, 147, 149–150, 168–169, 171–172, 183, 186, 188, 197, 202, 217–219
- Irenaeus 2, 3, 5–6, 10, 15–17, 31, 35, 37–42, 44, 47, 52–54, 60–64, 66, 69–71, 74, 77, 88, 104–107, 111–112, 129, 132, 146, 149, 157, 159, 163, 165–177, 191–192, 201, 204, 207, 208 n. 25, 221, 223, 229–230
- Jerome 56–57, 60, 63 n. 43, 73, 87, 94, 96–97 n. 58, 105–106, 124, 126 n. 5, 131–132, 152 n. 19, 153, 156, 172 n. 30, 182–183, 192–193, 219 n. 59, 223
- Jesus 23, 47, 66, 78, 101, 111, 113, 123, 126, 146–149, 150 n. 8, 151, 154, 156 n. 30, 157, 163 n. 1, 167, 172–175, 177, 179–180, 184–192, 194–197, 201–202, 207–211, 213, 213 n. 41, 214–218
- Jewish 80, 95, 102 n. 71, 127 n. 11, 151, 153, 189, 225
- Johannine corpus 1–5, 7–9, 47, 73, 151, 160, 230–231
- Johannophobia 3, 45 n. 67
- John the Baptist 187–188, 192, 201, 209–211, 213
- Jordan 187–188, 197–198, 213
- Josephus 56, 57 n. 19, 132, 137
- Judas 72 n. 77, 112–113
- Justin Martyr 56, 63, 78, 156, 221
- Labyrinth* 56, 59
- Logos 66, 111, 126, 141–142, 151 n. 14, 194
- Marcion 40, 128, 155, 157–159, 166 n. 10, 167, 180, 194 n. 36
- Marcionites 152, 155, 195
- Mary (mother of Jesus) 126, 149, 214, 216
- Maximilla 63 n. 43, 226
- Miltiades 63, 71 n. 75, 72 n. 77
- miracles 188, 201
- Montanism 6, 38, 44, 52, 60 n. 31, 63 n. 43, 64–65, 66 n. 51, 67–74, 80–81, 147, 169–170, 193, 195, 231
- Montanist 6, 16 n. 3, 18, 34, 36, 44, 53, 58, 62–66, 70–74, 76–77, 81, 99, 109, 126 n. 6, 134 n. 32, 225
- Montanists 2–3, 16 n. 3, 34, 37, 39, 41, 46, 54, 60, 63 n. 43, 65, 66 n. 50, 69–74, 109, 126 n. 6, 169–170, 231
- Muratorian Fragment* 30, 39, 52 n. 6, 54, 57, 60, 69–70, 72 n. 81, 159, 192, 204, 207, 210, 218 n. 56, 222
- Nepos 80–81
- New Prophecy 18, 55, 62–63, 69–72, 169–170
- Nicene orthodoxy 128, 142, 232
- Noetians 5, 63 n. 43, 140
- oral tradition 41, 209–210
- Origen 6, 10–11, 15, 19–20, 36, 40, 42, 47, 60, 66 n. 52, 67–68, 80, 91, 96, 123–127, 151–152, 157, 163, 177–202, 204, 206–208, 211–213, 215, 217, 219–220, 222–231
- orthodox 1–4, 7–8, 36, 38–40, 43, 45, 52–56, 63, 74, 91–93, 99, 109, 115, 127 n. 11, 142, 147, 155, 158 n. 38, 166, 232
- Panarion* 5, 9–10, 49, 119, 124–130, 134–137, 141 n. 62, 142, 144 n. 4, 147–148, 155, 172, 181–183, 195, 229, 232



- Papias 10, 66, 77 n. 93, 103–107, 112, 113, 140, 159, 163–167, 176–179, 200–201, 202 n. 6, 203–208, 210–212, 218–219, 221, 231
- Paraclete 16, 36, 41, 54, 58, 60–61, 65, 69–70, 73–74, 168–169, 170 n. 25, 171, 193, 230
- Passover 22, 24, 140, 146, 154, 173–175, 188–191, 195
- Paul (the Apostle) 16, 27, 31, 61, 65, 71, 77–78, 86 n. 6, 111–112, 124, 158 n. 38, 167–169, 171, 173, 178, 181, 189
- Philaster 17, 25, 133–137
- Philosabbatius 46 n. 75, 149–151, 153–154, 160, 187 n. 20, 214–216, 230
- Photius 17, 34 n. 3, 56–57, 59–61, 65, 94, 130 n. 21, 131–133, 137 n. 47, 193
- Phrygians 24, 221
- Polycarp 66, 77 n. 93, 163, 173, 208
- Polycrates 61, 66
- Porphyry 46 n. 75, 145, 149–154, 160, 187 n. 20, 214–217, 230
- Praxeas 63 n. 43, 73 n. 86
- Ps.-Tertullian 17, 62, 65, 69–70, 111 n. 91, 112, 133–137
- Ptolemy 38
- Quartodecimans 5–6, 39, 134
- Quintilla 226
- resurrection 19, 75, 90, 207
- Rome 2 n. 4, 6–7, 30 n. 48, 34 n. 3, 38–39, 43, 49 n. 82, 52–54, 55 n. 13, 56, 57 n. 19, 60, 64, 69–72, 73 n. 86, 80, 131–132, 137, 156 n. 30, 193
- Salim 20, 185, 187–188, 202, 213
- Shepherd of Hermas* 70, 72 n. 81
- Synoptic Gospels 3 n. 5, 19, 22, 32, 36, 44 n. 63, 68–69, 146, 148–149, 157, 165, 173, 177–179, 187–192, 194–195, 197, 200, 206–207, 209–211, 213, 219, 231
- Syriac 29 n. 42, 32, 35–36, 95, 84 n. 3, 96, 102 n. 71, 138 n. 51, 156 n. 29, 224
- Tatian 155–156, 180, 191–192
- Tertullian 6, 63, 65–66, 71, 73 n. 86, 159, 207, 221, 230
- Themiso 65, 77
- Theodoret 56, 60, 78–79, 92–93, 132
- Theophilus of Antioch 156, 157 n. 32, 221
- Valentinians 40, 47, 146, 152, 154, 156 n. 30, 157, 160, 167, 173–175, 191, 208 n. 25, 230
- Valentinus 38, 174, 180
- Victorinus of Pettau 60, 126 n. 5, 172 n. 30, 204, 210, 223
- Zephyrinus 18, 35, 37, 39–41, 55–56, 59–60, 62, 192